

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A-QUARTERLY-JOURNAL-OF-THE-CHRISTIAN-THOUGHT-AND-LIFE
SET-FORTH-FROM-THE-SCRIPTURES-BY-EMANUEL-SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXXVII, No. 3



JULY, 1930

The Problems of Biblical Criticism as Bearing
Upon the Word of the Lord

EVERETT KING BRAY 257

Swedenborg and Human History

JOHN R. SWANTON, Ph.D. 288

The Correspondence of the Flag of the United
States of America

MAURICE WORCESTER TURNER, M. D. 320



(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Position of Urbana University in the Thought and Life of the Church	LEWIS F. HITE	339
--	---------------	-----

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

Duly Humble	EVERETT K. BRAY	353
The Pre-Natal and the Post-Natal in the Spiritual Realm of Being	JACOB POSTMA	359

Current Literature :

W. E. Orchard's "The Present Crisis in Religion"	LEWIS F. HITE	370
J. Gresham Machen's "The Virgin Birth of Christ"	AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D.	378
Edwin Franden Dakin's "Mrs. Eddy; The Biography of a Virginal Mind"	B. A. WHITTEMORE	381

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. \$2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—
President, Rev. Paul Sperry, 1824 Park Road, Washington, D. C.; Vice-Pres-
ident, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1419 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia,
Pa.; Secretary, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.;
Treasurer, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXVII.] JULY, 1930

[No. 3

THE PROBLEMS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AS BEARING UPON THE WORD OF THE LORD*

BY THE REV. EVERETT KING BRAY

BIBLICAL Criticism is Bible study which is critical of its own assumptions and methods. It seeks to approach its subject matter without preconceived ideas, and to reach conclusions on evidence. In its modern phase it is as old as Swedenborg.

More usually Biblical Criticism is divided into two main branches, a lower and a higher. Lower criticism is textual study. Its whole inquiry is what the text of any given Scripture is. It seeks to establish the best attested readings at all points.

The Higher Criticism again divides into two studies. Literary criticism asks, and seeks to answer with facts, such questions as: by what literary process, whether compilation or otherwise, a Scripture was written; by whom; when; with what purpose; for what first audience. Historical criticism

*This paper was read at the meeting of the Council of Ministers, in Cambridge on June 18th, as the Report of the Committee on Problems of Biblical Criticism, of which Mr. Bray is Chairman. While mainly the work of Mr. Bray, he wishes it understood that material supplied by other members of the Committee has been incorporated in it,—for instance, the first two pages as far as the paragraph beginning "The period of Modern Criticism" were supplied by Rev. Wm. F. Wunsch. The three other members of the Committee were Rev. Messrs. Gould, Diaconoff, and Warren Goddard.

asks what value for history a particular Scripture may have which records history.

At present our Committee is concerning itself only with lower or textual criticism, its findings, and their relation to the Theological Works of Swedenborg.

The textual critic has first to acquaint himself with a very large mass of material in Old Testament and New Testament. In the case of the Old Testament this means the Masoretic text, and underlying it the consonantal text, and the versions, —for the former he has printed Bibles and some MSS. to examine. In the New Testament there are over 150 Uncial MSS. and over 2,000 Cursives. Beyond acquaintance with this material is the work of comparing, weighing, and inter-relating all texts,—the last a difficult work as well as an extended one in the case of the New Testament.

The more general findings of textual criticism as regards both Old Testament and New may be stated as follows:

1. Criticism finds that the Scripture text has been transmitted to us with remarkable fidelity. It has been preserved with incredible trustworthiness. For the Old Testament criticism has established the essential soundness of the Hebrew text. The so-called Masoretic text reflects best the original Hebrew text. For the New Testament, textual criticism has had to abandon the position that the so-called *Textus Receptus* is the sole reliable text, in order to make its way in the mass of the more authentic MSS., to the original Christian Scriptures.

2. Textual criticism finds that verbal variations for Old Testament and New Testament run into hundreds of thousands. Some of these variations are important for the sense, but most are unimportant. They are not more numerous than the student would expect in writings so old. They do not affect the substance of the thought and message of either Old Testament or New Testament.

3. Criticism finds in no one text of Scripture, or in any text which can be gathered from the mass of available material, a text which is wholly free from imperfection, break,

or corruption. There are passages which it is unable to restore. But criticism offers the present generation a more dependable text than was available for any preceding generation.

The work of textual criticism, though it has been consistent and widespread for over a hundred years, is of course still in progress. Even the collation of material is unfinished.

The period of Modern Criticism is given by Hastings' "Bible Dictionary" as "from 1750 to 1900," the beginning of which may suggest to us its issuance from the Last Judgment, and the query if it may not be a this-world continuation of that Judgment, centered in the Lord as the Son of Man, i. e., the Word. The course of criticism, too, has been true to the course of judgment, having both its destructive and its constructive edges. Consequently we believe that Bible Criticism, and the problems it faces and deals with, hold special interest, and challenge, to New-Churchmen.

Of reverent critical studies we approve. We believe there is nothing intrinsically wrong or irreverent in submitting the text of the Word, or the human element in its authorship, or its history, to a scientific scrutiny. We believe, also, that the results of such scrutiny may be extremely valuable to our understanding of the "sense of the letter"; and that for this reason also we ought to make ourselves familiar with its results.

We find, however, that in pursuing these results, the light which we have upon the Divinity of The Word, may lead us to conclusions quite divergent from those which sometimes others draw from the same results. As example of this, Christopher North, writing on "Textual or Lower Criticism" in the new "Abingdon Commentary," draws and states his conclusions from results of those studies thus: "If God had been pleased to communicate to men Scriptures verbally inspired, He would surely have provided that their text should be transmitted without error. It is small comfort that the Scriptures should once have been inspired in the very letter, if, owing to the accidents of transmission, the letter

is sometimes uncertain,"—which he is certain that it is (pp. 129-30).

The very opposite conclusion, based upon the same results, is reached by Rev. Samuel Noble, as stated in *The Intellectual Repository* (Vol. 1, New Series, for 1824-25, page 297). There, after referring to the mistakes of Rome in trying to defy the truths of science by papal bull, he says: "Equally vain will it be for us to deny facts which the progress of science has brought to light. Sooner or later they will be universally admitted: and it will be found eventually that acknowledging it to be true that some mistakes have been introduced by the transcribers into the sacred text, no more invalidates the essential doctrine of the New Church, that the Holy Word is written by plen̄ary Divine inspiration as to every word and syllable, than the acknowledging the sun, and not the earth, to be the center of this mundane system, invalidates the truth of the Scriptures in general."

The series of scholarly studies of the text of the Word which Rev. Samuel Noble conducted from 1823 to 1825 while Editor of the *Repository*, are well worthy of careful study and re-examination by the New Church today. His studies led him to agree with Dr. Bentley, as quoted in Horne's "Introduction to the Scriptures," that: "The real text of the sacred writers does not now, since the originals have been so long lost, lie in any single manuscript or edition, but is dispersed in them all. But," Dr. Bentley proceeds, "it is competently exact, indeed, even in the worst manuscript now extant; nor is one article of faith, or moral precept, either perverted or lost in them." "And," Noble comments, "if this is the case with the worst copies, no doubt the received text contains the sacred original in a great degree of purity." (*The Intellectual Repository*, Vol. VI of former series, 1823, pp. 521-22.) Such measure of perfection he considers sufficient "to answer all the purposes of a Divine revelation under a dispensation in which the spiritual sense of the Word was not revealed." But now that we have revealed "a knowledge of the importance of things apparently minute to the

integrity of the spiritual sense," he sees the hand of Providence in "the industry which so many learned men have exerted since 1750" in this field. He continues: "So, when the readings of all the copies are brought together, as is now in a great measure done, it may be expected that a text will at last be formed, which shall exactly represent the original autographs. As yet, perhaps, the collections of these learned men are of much more value than their corrections; but a new generation of them will doubtless by and by succeed, whose minds being more open to a perception of the interior truths of the Word, they will select the readings in which they are conveyed with more discrimination. Others have labored; and the learned of the New Church will enter into their labors . . . wherefore its letter also is to be restored to its primitive integrity" (pp. 521-523). He sees no inconsistency here with the doctrine "that the Word is holy and Divinely inspired as to every jot and tittle"; or with Swedenborg's statement, "that the Word, by the special care of Providence, has been preserved entire, on account of its containing a spiritual sense in every expression." In what copy it has been preserved entire Swedenborg does not state; "but certainly the assertion is true if, among all the copies, the true readings are somewhere preserved" (p. 523). "A copy in the original tongue," he declares, "must be greatly corrupted indeed, if it does not retain more of the pure Word of God than can possibly be conveyed into another language" (p. 144). And to point out how slight the discrepancies in the original readings are, he quotes Griesbach as saying, "I confess that most of the various readings, though not all, are extremely trifling"; so that, instead of reproaching the critics for bringing the various readings to light, "we ought to rise from the perusal of their labors with gratitude to Divine Providence, which has so watched over the preservation of the Scriptures, that very few important corruptions should be propagated among so many copies:—for as all the varieties of reading have now been examined, not only by me, but by many learned men, it may be seen with certainty by every

one, that the suspicions which have been raised by the adversaries against the integrity of the sacred text, and the certainty of the Christian religion as thereon depending, are frivolous and vain" (p. 587).

We quote these extracts from Rev. Samuel Noble's treatment of the problems of the Bible text, not to ask for any ready-made acceptance of his conclusions, but to bring before us the valuable study that one able New-Churchman contributed to our subject a century ago, and to recommend it for careful re-examination by present and future students of these problems.

As stated by Principal John Skinner, in Peake's "Commentary," p. 40, "The aim of textual criticism . . . [is] to recover as nearly as possible the exact form in which a book left the hand of its author. . . . [And so] the farther back we can trace the text of any writing, the nearer we shall be to that object. It is true that in the case of the Old Testament books we never come within measurable distance of the original autographs; but still we are able, by the methods indicated in this article, to eliminate a great many sources of error which have affected MSS. at different stages in the transmission of the text.

"The materials for this investigation fall broadly into three classes:

"(1) MSS. and editions of the Hebrew text itself. These of course have descended by successive transcriptions from the autograph copies of various writings. But the existing Hebrew MSS. are all of comparatively recent date [owing, in part, at least to the Jewish custom of burying with reverent ceremony beside some rabbi, worn and faded copies of the Scriptures (A New Standard Bible Dictionary)] . . . and, besides, they present so little variation that from them alone we could hardly form any conclusions as to previous development of the text. (2) MSS and editions of a large number of translations made at different times, either directly from the Hebrew (primary versions) or from some earlier translation (daughter versions) . . . A version has

critical value only in so far as it furnishes independent evidence of the existence of a characteristic form of text at the time when it was made . . . In the case of older versions, which originated long before any known MSS. were written, we do not know what their basis was, and can ascertain it only by the delicate process of re-translation into Hebrew. This operation, if it can be satisfactorily performed, will obviously give us the text of one or more Hebrew MSS., contemporary with the date of translation . . . (3) Quotations and allusions by writers of known date, from which we can discover what readings were found in contemporary MSS. of the Hebrew Bible, or of the version which they used. Along side of these we may place the mass of observations on the Hebrew text which constitute the staple of the Jewish Massora."

Dr. Albert C. Knudson, writing on the Old Testament, in "An Outline of Christianity" (Dodd, Mead & Co., 1926), says: "There are three main grounds on which it is possible to call in question the correctness of the traditional Hebrew text of the Old Testament. And these three grounds have marked out the chief lines along which the development of textual criticism has proceeded. First, there are variant readings in the different Hebrew MSS. . . . Bishop Kennicott in 1776-80 published the readings of 634 Hebrew MSS.; and the Italian scholar de Rossi in 1784-88 added a collation of 825 more. The net result of these investigations was conservative. All the MSS. exhibited a remarkable agreement; and this holds true of the MSS. that have since been discovered. The text, at least since the date of the oldest Hebrew MSS., has been preserved with scrupulous care. [But the MSS. do not take us back of the 10th Century A. D.] . . .

"[Second, the text was consonantal first; vowel points and accents were added later. But] though the vowel points and accents were introduced by the Massorites, it was generally admitted that they represent a long standing tradition. The Massoretic text is practically identical with that adopted by the Jews about A. D. 100.

"Third, it is quite possible that in the meantime [i. e., between the original writing and the oldest extant MSS., or even that of 100 A. D.] the text had undergone considerable corruption. Indeed, the circumstances under which the text was transmitted in pre-Christian times makes this probable. Absence of vowel points, change in the form of the letters from the Old Hebrew to the square characters introduced after the Exile, the carelessness of the scribes, the similarity of form in the case of several of the Hebrew letters, the obscurity of faded MSS.—such facts as these would almost inevitably lead to errors in copying; and once introduced into the text they were likely to be perpetuated. Then, too, is the evidence that the text was not held intact during this period. This is found in those passages of the Old Testament which lie before us in a double form: e. g., Isa. 36-39 corresponds to 2 Ki. 18:30-20:19; Jer. 52 to 2 Ki. 25*; Ps. 18 to 2 Sam. 22; and Ezra 2 to Neh. 7. A comparison of these . . . reveals differences in the text that must have been due to scribal errors. Only such errors also can account for many of the obscure and unintelligible places in the Old Testament text. . . .

"The LXX text may be used as a means of correcting the Massoretic text. Indeed the great task now confronting textual critics is that of determining the true reading of the LXX;† and then utilizing it in the restoration of the original text. Scarcely any other resource is left to them but conjecture, and in the overwhelming majority of cases conjectural emendations are untrustworthy. Only in a comparatively few instances have they been accepted as manifestly correct. On this point the New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, Vol. 2, p. 172, remarks: 'In the Old Testament the difference of the Massoretic text from that of

*It really begins at 2 Ki. 24:18.

†The uncertainty of its true reading is due to the variations of its reading in its several different recensions.

LXX means the Septuagint; and M.T. below means the Massoretic Text.

the Septuagint, proves the two to be independent witnesses; but the fact that the text of the latter is not yet settled, makes difficult the task of arbitrating between the two.' And Hastings' Bible Dictionary, in the article on the Old Testament text, says: 'The fact that the Hebrew text which was the basis of the LXX frequently differed from the M. T. is apparent.' But that 'from the circumstance of this difference it by no means follows that the Hebrew text used for the LXX was a better one than the Massoretic text. (This assumption is a capital error of the painstaking work of A. W. Streane on Jeremiah.) Owing to the variety of translations a special examination is required for every part of the Old Testament. The LXX is of most use for the recovery of the Hebrew text in the books of Samuel, Ezekiel, and partially Kings. E. g., see I S. 8:16, where LXX is correct; but in many passages the text was corrupt even prior to the LXX. E. g., I S. 6:19, "50070"; and 2 S. 15:7, "40".'

"Some of the differences which show themselves between parallel passages (in the M. T. and the LXX) may be explained by the assumption that they are due to an intention on the part of a later author or redactor . . . an example must be the variations of the Dt. Decalogue from Exodus 20. The same is true (intention) of diversity of construction of the Hebrew word Elohim, which is plural in Ex. 32:4, 8, and singular in Neh. 9:18; and so 2 Sam. 7:23, but different in I Chr. 17:21. It is very remarkable that the revising activity of the Sopherim is less manifest in Chron. than in the books that were earlier accepted as canonical. . . . In many instances, however, we must assume an error in the tradition: Gen. 10:3, 4 Riphath and Dodanim, I Chr. Diphath and Rodanim; I Ki. 5:6 (Eng. 4:26) '40,000,' but 2 Chr. 9:25 '4,000'; I Ki. 7:26 '2,000,' but 2 Chr. 4:5 '3,000'; I Ki. 7:24 'knops' (pekaim), but 2 Chr. 4:3, 'oxen,' (bekarim). Both texts cannot be correct. . . . Possible sources of error are: freaks of the eye, or (in cases of dictation) of the ear, wandering of the memory (e. g., the put-

ting down of a synonymous word, cf. 2 S. 22:7 and Ps. 18:6), false interpretations of abbreviations, or, conversely, failure to recognize the abbreviated form of words. All these sources of change and of error were of course also at work in those passages where, on account of the non-existence of a parallel passage, we cannot so readily recognize them."

To these causes of error in transcription, Skinner, in Peake's "Commentary" as above, adds, "accidental omission or transposition of consonants; repetition of a word or group of letters already written; longer omissions caused by identical ending of two sentences, and the slipping of the scribe's eye from the one he had just copied to the other"; "errors of memory" causing "substitution of a synonym for the original expression (like say for speak), or the addition of a familiar phrase or epithet (as in ark 'of the covenant'), or the alteration or amplification of the text in accordance with some well known parallel passage; (and) errors of understanding, (which) are seen chiefly in mistaken divisions of words and sentences, in misinterpretations of abbreviations, and in incorporation of marginal glosses in the text."

"Conscious alteration of the text," he says, "naturally occurred most frequently in the early stages of transmission, and cannot always be distinguished from the process of redaction in which many of the Old Testament books had their origin; but that post-redactional additions and corrections are actually found in the text is shown in some cases by a comparison of the different versions, and in other cases is probable from internal indications. A common form of expansion is the introduction of explanatory glosses giving the accepted interpretation of a difficult or ambiguous expression in the authentic text (see Isa. 3:1 b), or enhancing the accuracy of a prediction by a reference to its supposed fulfilment (Isa. 7:8 b). Systematic correction of the text occurs most frequently under the influence of dogmatic or aesthetic tendencies (cf. the regular substitution in the books of Sam-

uel of bosheth, "shame," for Baal in the names of Ishbosheth, Mephibosheth, with the original names in Ch.); but occasionally under the impression that the traditional reading is wrong (thus in Gen. 2:2 "seventh" in the Hebrew is deliberately changed to "sixth" in Samaritan, LXX, and Syr.). It may be noted that certain changes of this kind were introduced in the synagogue reading (*Qere*) while the written text was left untouched; and on the other hand, that Jewish tradition preserved a knowledge of the fact that at an earlier period they were made in the consonantal text. In the detection of both the above classes of alterations the versions often render important service. If two textual witnesses show a difference in the Hebrew original which can be naturally traced to any of the causes just enumerated the divergence is at once explained, and it will generally be clear on which side the mistake lies, and which is the true reading. Or, the mere omission in one text of a passage found in the other, but unnecessary in the context, may be a sufficient reason for doubting its genuineness. Again, interpolation may reasonably be suspected when a passage occurs in two texts but at different places (e. g., I S. 2:1-10 is inserted by the LXX in the middle of 1:28 of the Hebrew); the probable explanation being that it originally stood in the margin of some MSS., and was taken into the text at the wrong place. But the sources of error here mentioned may often lead on internal grounds to an emendation even where all textual witnesses support the doubtful reading." (Peake's Commentary, pp. 42-43.)

Dr. Lewis Bayles Paton, writing on the Old Testament text, in "A New Standard Bible Dictionary," gives these additional considerations to the question of text corruption: viz., "During the period from 900 B. C. to the formation of the canon the text was exposed to many vicissitudes in consequence of the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian wars, the fall of Samaria and of Jerusalem, and other national catastrophes. Internal evidence shows that it underwent extensive corruption; e. g.: (1) A number of passages are given

twice in the Old Testament (see Girdlestone, *Deuterographs*, 1894). In all these cases we find wide variation in the readings of the two recensions. (2) A number of poems of the Old Testament are partly alphabetic. The object of the alphabetic arrangement is to assist memory, hence when we find it only partly carried out, we must assume that something has been lost out of the text. (3) Many passages of the Old Testament demand the assumption of textual corruption from the fact that they yield no clear meaning. Thus I S. 13:1 in Hebrew reads, 'Saul was a year old when he began to reign, and he reigned two years.' (4) Some evident mistakes in the text are found also in the earliest versions, so that they must have originated at a very early date. Many of them are explainable only on the hypothesis of the use of the old Phenician character.

"During the period between the fifth and the third centuries B. C. the so-called 'square character,' used by the Aramaic-speaking peoples, drove the old Phenician character out of general use, although it still appeared on coins of the Maccabean period. As a result of this change the books of the Old Testament were gradually transcribed from the old into the new letters, and in this process many new errors unavoidably came into the text. Some errors (found also in the most ancient versions) are explained only through the use of the square character, and therefore must have originated in this period. The recension that then became current in Palestine, and that was there regarded as authoritative, we may for convenience call the text of the Canon, inas-much as this was the period during which the Canons of the Law and of the Prophets received their final form, and most of the Writings also came to be regarded as canonical. No MSS. of the period of the Canon have survived. The descendants of this recension through comparison of whose readings its text must be restored, are the text of the Sophirim (Scribes), the Samaritan Pentateuch, the early Targums, and the LXX.

"The most important line of transmission of the Hebrew

text of the Old Testament was in the MSS. prepared by the religious authorities in Palestine. Here in the 2d century of the Christian era a standard text was adopted that is the parent of all existing MSS., and of most of the versions of the Old Testament. This is the so-called text of the *Sopherim*. The extraordinary similarity of the MSS., both of the Palestinian and Babylonian type—a similarity which extends even to the reproduction of errors and exceptional letters—and the close agreement of all the versions made since the beginning of the Christian era, prove the thesis of Lagarde to be correct, that all these recensions are descendants from a single prototype, the so-called text of the *Sopherim*. At some time in the 2d century the exigencies of controversy with Christians, and the desire to have a fixed basis of discussion between the Rabbis, led to the adoption by the Jewish authorities of an official standard of the Old Testament. Since that time all copies have been made directly or indirectly from that codex, and variant codices have been destroyed. The result is that no ancient differences of reading have come down to us in this family, but only variants that have arisen since the standard codex was adopted. A memory of the adoption of this standard codex is preserved in various forms in Jewish tradition. In the Babylonian Talmud (*Sopherim* 6:4) it is recorded that three Temple MSS. were the basis of our present text, and that the principle followed was to regard that reading as correct in which two MSS. agreed. According to a tradition reported by Lagarde (*Materialien zur Kritik und Geschichte des Pentateuchs*, 1868, i, 230 f.), all existing MSS. of the Old Testament are copies of a single codex that was rescued in the fall of Bithher, the last refuge of the Jews in the war of independence.

“Having adopted a standard text, the Jewish authorities provided for its accurate transmission by raising up a body of professional scribes to whom they entrusted the copying, pronunciation, and interpretation of the sacred records. These scribes are known as the Massorites (*Massora* =

'tradition'). Such elaborate rules were laid down for their guidance in copying that it became almost impossible for them to make mistakes. From that time to this the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible has remained practically unchanged. In the 7th century A. D. the vowel points and accents were inserted in the text." (P. 639.)

We are reminded in the article on Old Testament text in the New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, that while "The Hebrew writing, like Semitic writing in general, was essentially consonantal, the vowels . . . not written, (yet) that while the language lived this occasioned no difficulty to the speakers or readers." It should be remembered, too, as stated by Dr. Knudson, that "though the vowel points and accents were introduced (into the text) by the Massorites, they represent a long standing tradition." Thus they were but signs for pronunciations that had been the habitual practice in reading the consonantal text. They cannot, then, be looked upon as addition to the text, but as fixation of the text as it had lived in spoken practice before the Hebrew language began to become a "dead language."

Dr. Paton, in the article quoted above, concisely defines the work of the Massora, thus: "The Massora ('tradition') is a sort of text-critical commentary written in the margin of most of the codices. It contains the observations and discussions of the Tiberian scribes during the period from the 2d to the 10th century of our era. It counts the number of sections, sentences, and words in books; it enumerates passages in which unusual forms occur; it calls attention to abnormal letters, spelling, vocalization, or accentuation, and warns the scribe against changing these. Words that it regards as incorrect it marks with a small circle, and inserts in the margin the Qere [what is read], or supposedly correct reading, the vowels of which are placed under the Kethibh [what is written], or form in the text. Similar in character are the *Sebhirin* ('opinions') that suggest an alternate reading to the one in the text. Variant readings of MSS. and of other rabbinical schools are also recorded. The Massora

has been the means by which the extraordinary uniformity that now exists in the MSS. has been secured, and its authority must be final in deciding between variant readings of the Tiberian recension." (P. 642.) And "all printed editions of the Hebrew Bible are based upon MSS. with the Tiberian system of vocalization" (*ibid.*).

Since the purpose of this report is to bring before us a basis for well-advised further studies from the New-Church point-of-interest and point-of-view, we wish to add the following statement, by Dr. Paton, in the article above, on "The Process of Text Reconstruction": "Because of the lack of ancient MSS., the restoration of original texts is possible only through comparison of existing MSS. Here the method must be a reversal of the genealogical process by which errors were produced. A comparison must be made of the characteristics of a group of closely related MSS. in order to determine the characteristics of their common ancestor; and, by a comparison of other groups, the characteristics of other ancestors. These ancestors may again be compared, in their turn, to discover a still earlier prototype, and this, once more, may be compared with other prototypes discovered in the same manner. Thus, beginning with MSS. and printed editions, one may work backward along converging lines toward the original record from which all extant textual material is descended. This process implies that we are able to arrange our documents in genealogical order.

"In accordance with these principles, the process by which the text of the Old Testament is to be reconstructed is as follows: (1) All extant Palestinian MSS. and printed editions, with their Massora and the remarks of medieval Jewish commentators, should be compared in order to discover the Tiberian prototype of the 7th cent. This work has practically been done in the Massoretico-critical editions of Baer, and Ginsburg. (2) All Babylonian MSS., with their Massora, should be compared in order to discover the Babylonian prototype of the 7th cent. (3) The Palestinian

prototype and the Babylonian prototype should be compared with the restored originals of the Peshitto, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Quinta, Sexta, Septima, Origen, Jerome, Sa' adia, Grecus Venetus, the later Targums, and citations in the Talmud, Midrashim, and other Jewish writings in order to determine the text of the standard codex of the Sopherim of the 2d cent. (4) the text of the Sopherim, being thus restored, it should be compared with the Samaritan, the Targums, the original text of the Greek version, restored by a similar genealogical study of all their recensions and secondary versions, in order to discover the text of the Canon. (5) The final step in the process should be the restoration of the text of the original autographs.

"Where passages are duplicated in the Old Testament, criticism has a basis for comparison; but where this is not the case, documentary evidence fails us, and we are compelled to resort to conjectural emendation of doubtful passages. Such criticism is always precarious; still conjectures that rest upon exact knowledge of the Hebrew language and thorough acquaintance with Hebrew literature are often extremely probable.

"It is needless to say that the elaborate process here sketched has never yet been thoroughly carried out for a single book of the Old Testament. Many years must elapse before the criticism of the versions shall be so complete that they can be used in the proper way for the emendation of the Hebrew text. Meanwhile textual criticism follows as far as possible the lines of research just indicated, but is compelled to be more or less eclectic and tentative.

"No critical edition of the Old Testament text exists as yet, and even the Revised Version of the Old Testament is made from an unrevised text.

"The separate volumes of Haupt's 'Sacred Books of the Old Testament,' (this is the 'Polychrome' edition), so far as they have appeared, give a revised text. Kittel's Hebrew Bible is the Textus Receptus with critical apparatus. . . ." (A New Standard Bible Dictionary, p. 644.)

Beside this statement of method for recovery of the text, it is of interest to place the outline which Noble proposed as the method for a New-Church student to pursue. He says (Vol. 1, as above, p. 297): "The evidences by which we propose to decide upon the passages which we conceive to be erroneous, are: 1. Other copies; 2. The ancient versions; 3. Evident reason; and 4. The spiritual sense." Note the extra test for the New Church at No. 4.

With some of the generalities, and a few particulars, of the case against the present text of the Old Testament thus brought before us as a basis for reflection, let us first turn to some qualifying statements tending to discount the gravity of whatever accusations have seemed cause for alarm. Recalling the passage from Griesbach, quoted above by Noble, to the effect that, "most of the various readings, though not all, are extremely trifling, . . . (so) that the suspicions which have been raised against the integrity of the sacred text, and the certainty of the Christian religion as thereon depending, are frivolous and vain"; from this, we pass to Dr. Knudson's article, as above, in "An Outline of Christianity," as he says: "The standard text of the Old Testament is thus not free from error . . . But the most important result is to be found in the opposite direction, in the establishment of the essential soundness of the Hebrew text. Not only has it been shown to be superior to the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint, as well as the other versions, but there is no reason to doubt that it is in the main a faithful reproduction of the original documents. Under the circumstances this is a remarkable fact . . . But steady progress is being made in the way of improving the text." In agreement with this is Hermann L. Strack, writing on the text of the Old Testament, in Hastings' "Bible Dictionary," as he says: "We have seen that the text of the Old Testament books has undergone not a few changes since their composition. We must be careful, however, not to exaggerate the importance of these changes. The circum-

stance that we are able to analyze, in the main, with perfect confidence, most sections of the Pentateuch . . . is a convincing proof that even the sum of all the changes in question has been far smaller than critics like Aug. Klostermann have held it to be."

Of like strain is the testimony of Prin. John Skinner, writing in Peake's "Commentary." He says: "It should be clearly understood that all witnesses to the text exhibit a fundamental agreement. An extreme case of divergence is the difference between the Massoretic Text and the LXX in the book of Jeremiah. But even here the element common to the two recensions amounts to seven-eighths of the whole. The normal relation of the LXX to the Massoretic Text is such that in the majority of books the differences are mostly of detail, which leave the broad features of the text, the characteristics of the style, and the essential meaning of the writers almost unaffected. Of all accessible forms of the text, the Massoretic Text is on the whole the most reliable, and the most faithful to what must have been the Hebrew original."

Such results as the above are sufficient to satisfy very well almost any concept of the Scriptures held outside of the New Church. At least, so one would think. But in the New Church even the exact words have importance for the sake of the exactitude and continuity of the spiritual and celestial senses. Our concern therefore goes farther than that of others. To the point here is the statement of Knudsen, that "Modern textual or lower criticism has attracted less general interest, and has led to less significant results, than the other forms of Old Testament criticism . . . due almost wholly to the nature of the available data. The facts have not warranted so marked a departure from traditional opinion in the case of the text as they have in the case of the other aspects of the Old Testament. Hence religious prejudices have not been aroused, nor popular interest especially awakened in this field."

Accordingly we shall weigh with different concern from

that of others, the cases where the appearance is a challenge to the integrity of some portion of the text. Our real concern will be limited to the thirty-four books which have the continuous internal sense. This fact will at once predispose us, when there is contrast between the texts of two Old Testament books and one of them is of the "34", and the other is not, to see "higher" reasons for trusting the text of the one that is of the "34"—for the purpose for which it primarily exists. We shall be well aware that it is quite possible that "historical fact" may be with the uninspired book, and yet that the different form of statement may be required in the inspired book for the sake of the correspondent senses. We say that we shall know that this is a possibility—to be adequately weighed.

Another distinction which we shall exhibit will be that our attitude toward the text will be positive first, negative only after spiritual as well as natural considerations shall dictate it; yet we shall be more anxious than others to weigh all things. That the Doctrines may "rule all nations with a rod of iron," their evangelists need all the natural light, as well as spiritual, that they can get; and this includes natural light on the letter of the Word, as well as that "letter" itself. We must pursue our studies in hopes of finding new natural-light confirmations of the higher claims which the Doctrines make for the books of the Word in their letter.

It is apparent that there may be many things from the point of view of a natural sense alone,—the single purpose always to tell with exact accuracy a given event, utterance, or fact,—which must be considered errors, inaccuracies, contradictions, interpolations, glosses, or omissions, but that from the point of view of the spiritual sense may not be flaws, but rather the perfections of the method of correspondent utterance in portraying spiritual sequences. There are many other such problems, which must be dealt with individually by those who are in knowledge of the spiritual sense, as will be apparent as we enter seriously into this study. Many examples will come to each one, such as:

repetitions of an idea in words slightly varied, one term celestial, the other spiritual; the numbers in armies, periods of time, dates, etc., given for the spiritual sense rather than historic and mathematic exactness; use of the terms of relationship with wide latitude for the same spiritual reason—as “brother” for cousin, etc., and “father” for grand-, or many times great-, grandfather, etc.: such as, the variant forms in the genealogies in Matt. and Luke, and the differences in order in the Lord’s wilderness temptations, and the different sequences in various other series of events and teachings in the Gospels, and in such matters of critical comment in the Old Testament as the Exodus and Deuteronomy variations in the Decalogue, etc., etc. Similarly, a passage given twice, even though a lengthy passage, must be studied first of all as the probable indication of a spiritual experience, period or stage, which has more than one setting, fits into more than one stage in the life-development of the soul.

One feature which we shall find particularly significant in studying texts which seem defective, will be that character in the Hebrew language which lends itself so superbly to the language of correspondence and representation, namely its picturesqueness not only of utterance, but also of form:—in short, the “orientalisms” of the Old Testament. A few hints of this are found in the following words from the article on the Hebrew Language in Peake’s “Commentary” (p. 35): “It has no elaborate system of expressing the subordination of sentences, it simply coordinates them by the conjunction ‘and’ . . . Imagination also plays a large part in the use of tenses. The perfect and imperfect do not determine the date, but only the character of an action as complete or incomplete; the date must be learnt from the context. Both tenses therefore may refer to the past, present, and future. A prophet speaking of the future can use the perfect, because he regards the event as already completed; e. g., Isa. 5:13, 9:1-6 . . . A poet can use the imperfect of a past act, because he pictures it as taking place

under the eye,—Ps. 18:1-20, Ex. 15:5, 12, 14.” Then there are numerous other aspects of this picture-element, such as, e. g., “its sparing use of particles, and the use of suffixed pronominal forms . . . word-formation by prefixes, by prefixed words, (and the fact that the noun, as the basis of the linguistic structure, is able, with pronominal fragments affixed, to ‘express various phases of verbal action’).” (*A New Standard Bible Dictionary*.) A further remark in the same article notes that “Most of the roots are expressions of physical facts and actions, and therefore intellectual and religious notions must be rendered figuratively and symbolically” (p. 336). This latter character alone requires that we keep in mind the expansion upward of their content as the idea ascends,—in other words, that from this fact they say “somewhat more than they say.”

We shall have to consider that the Word can be perfectly and minutely the Word, as to the absolute perfection of its correspondence with the societies of the heavens, in the languages into which it descended in its final form in revelation—and only in these. No translation can be perfect. That is why the preservation of the original languages is so important, and guarded so specifically by Providence, as the Doctrines insist. This fact finds illustration in Swedenborg’s slight variations in rendering of certain words and passages, as is illustrated, e. g., in Dr. T. F. Wright’s collation of the variations occurring throughout his works in rendering the Psalms (see “*Psalmi*”). Obviously sometimes there is no perfect equivalent in Latin, or in any other language; and of the nearest to it there may be two or three words or expressions of about equal approximation; perhaps, even, several of our words will be required to compass the range of picture included within a single word of the original. These are but self-evident truisms; yet we may be profited by keeping them in mind.

Of interest to us is comment like the following, on the superiority of the inspired books of Kings over the uninspired Chronicles: “In marked contrast to *Chronicles*, the

Books of Kings are striking examples of simplicity, clearness, and brilliancy." Ezra, Esther, and Nehemiah are placed also in the Chronicles class. But in spite of the fact that scholars find some "differences in style" among the Old Testament books, they declare that they are "not numerous"; and that, such as they are, these "consist in a general lack of lucidity" with those which do not measure wholly up to "the golden age of Heb. literature," and that "yet the general likeness is noteworthy in a language whose literary monuments cover 1,000 years." (See *A New Standard Bible Dictionary*, article on Hebrew Language.)

The general absence of certainty in the results of textual criticism, is markedly noticeable in the extracts which we have brought together in this report. The words "possible" and "probable" (Dr. Knudson, above), are really about as near certainty as we come in regard to the state of the Old Testament text from which is the accepted Massoretic text, of which our Authorized and Revised Versions are translations. There is a twilight zone surrounding the text which we have, when it is traced beyond the form in which we behold it under the superb care of the Massorites and their earlier brothers in this sacred task (shall we not say "commission"?). This, they trace back to around 100 A. D. That errors must have crept in before that time, is assumed on general principles, because of the hazards of copying MSS. by fallible humans. That the rules of practice with the Massorites made errors of transmission practically impossible is conceded. It is assumed that this scrupulous care of the text was a unique development with them; but there is no shown proof that such care may not have been vouchsafed from the earliest formation of the text. Before synagogue days (especially in days of the Temple), even a single collection of the Law, Prophets, and Writings, might have been sufficient for its preservation; and in such case only a few men would have been adequate for its accurate copying, so often as this had to be done.

There are peculiar forms which, admittedly, have the

appearance of error: such as repeated passages which have more or less variation; and such as passages which yield no clear meaning, and of which we are assured, "In a considerable number of passages which are unintelligible on account of textual corruption, the corruption is either shared by all the versions, or is replaced by something equally or more unintelligible. This means, of course, that the text contains defects which are of older standing than the date of any version. On these we have no sort of external check, except in the few cases where a passage is repeated within the Old Testament itself (parallel passages in S. K. and Chr.: 2 S. 22 and Ps. 18; 2 Ki. 18:13-20:19, and Isa 36-39; Isa. 2:2-5 and Mi. 4:1-5, etc.). (Peake's Commentary, p. 43.)

The assumption is made that these differences at points "must have been due to scribal errors" (whereas we must recognize the possibility of their being due to the needs of the "spiritual sense"). We would point out, that "passages . . . unintelligible," made so by "scribal error," seems about the least likely of the explanations offered, since it would involve either that the scribes did not know the meaning of what they copied, or that they did not read over passages after they had copied them. This does not seem likely with writings held so sacred that they should be laid up beside the ark in the temple. It is also offered as an explanation of why corruptions should have crept into the text, that "Inasmuch as the writings did not then [pre-Sopherim times] have in popular estimation the character they later came to possess, it is likely that they were less carefully handled, and that the same amount of pains was not taken in copying them." (New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, art. on Old Testament Text.) But here we submit the non-necessity for "popular estimation," if such care were only with the priesthood, as is quite possible, in the face of some other things. For example, the same authorities confess that "concerning the oldest history of the text of the Old Testament writings there exists almost

no positive information"; and that "no details are at hand concerning the way in which the text was multiplied and preserved" (*ibid.*).

Along side of this absence of all save circumstantial evidence for poorer preservation before the days of the elaborate Massoretic school, we have the strong traditions to the contrary. For example, Hastings tells us that "By the first century A. D. this idea [of the sacredness of words and letters of the Scriptures] had so far progressed that Philo said that the Jews had never altered a word of what Moses wrote . . . and Josephus, that no one had been so bold as to add anything to them [the Scriptures], to take any thing from them, or to make any change in them; and in the Talmud, in the words of a Rabbi, held to have lived in the First Century, the work of a copyist is called divine, and a warning is given against dropping or adding a letter." Noble quotes Van der Hooght in the preface to his 1705 edition of the Hebrew Bible, giving the "Rabbinical precept: Be admonished in regard to your work, it being the work of heaven; that if you by chance put in a letter too little, or too much, you do as much mischief as if you were to desolate the whole world" (Vol. 1, p. 150). Hastings, at this point, adds, "Synchronous with the growth of reverence for the letter was necessarily an endeavor to have a uniform text for use in the synagogues and schools. Efforts in this direction culminated not long after the fall of Jerusalem (A. D. 70), when, in the refounding of Judaism, a single consonantal text of the Old Testament, under the influence of Rabbi Akiba and his associates at Jamnia, was adopted as authoritative, and all others disappeared. The principle of its adoption is unknown" (Article on the Old Testament). That "the principle of its adoption is unknown"; and that even the Babylonian rabbinical traditions concerning its origin are not agreed (see Dr. Paton, above), makes dogmatic assertion of corruptions of the Palestinian text utterly impossible. The most that can be said is, "We suppose"; the accurate fact is, "We do not know." It is

conceivably possible that the text, with all its imperfections, which the scribes were forbidden to alter in any particular, may have been what it now is, from the beginning of the books' compilation; and that these imperfections of the letter are still the most proper mediums for the spirit . . . This is conceivable. Nothing less than the testing-out of the bearing of the spiritual sense in such cases, if this can be done adequately, would seem to bring them beyond the region of mere conjecture.

On the other hand, there is the question of when the process of the Word-formation with the Old Testament came to an end. It has been assumed by both Rev. Messrs. Samuel Noble and John Worcester, following statements in Swedenborg, that the Word is perfectly the Word only as it came in first utterance through the speaker and penman from the Lord, and that any changes admitted later were extraneous to the Word. This is possibly so. But we would suggest that the other possibility is worthy of being weighed. For, having knowledge of the operations of Providence "in leasts as in greatest" in all things of mere ordinary importance, we cannot suppose that His hand would be removed for any second of its existence from His Word, any more than in His first giving it. And, so long as His life with respect to mankind was operating in the plane and function of Word-formation, it is conceivably possible that in some respects the Word which was adequate and perfect for its end while the Word was not as yet whole, might be by Divine guidance changed in some particulars when that formation-period drew to an end, and the Word-giving was finished, the Word-in-the-letter completed, and the Canon closed. This close did not arrive until the Apocalypse was written. Some considerations in the valuable studies on this general subject in the early chapters of Rev. John Worcester's "Bread of Life," among which he likens the Word's formation to the formation of the earth's geological strata (although he does not make the application which we

suggest), seem to us to quite fit in with a consideration of this question.

Rev. John Worcester says, in the above article: "Down to the time when Caiaphas, not of himself, but as high priest, prophesied from the Spirit of the Lord Himself of the saving work of the Lord, the Spirit of the Lord was present with the representative churches to form the Divine Word . . . The inspiration and guidance did not interfere with the freedom of their state, but were a natural part of it . . . The period of Bible formation was completed when, from the representatives of the Lord's life while yet the church was representative, the Gospels were written, and John had added the visions of the last days as representatively shown in heaven. Even the Jews recognized that the formative presence of the Divine Spirit had then departed from them; and they devoted themselves with a marvelous zeal and patience to the preservation of that which had been written, as to every jot and tittle exactly as it was written. Nothing could now be added; nothing must be lost." (Pp. 87-88.)

In regard to the purpose of the alphabetic arrangement of certain Psalms being for assistance to memory, we may raise a question, as we have to do in numerous other matters, and ask if there may not be a spiritual reason which can be satisfied without the assumption that portions have been lost where the alphabetic sequence is not complete. In fact, the question of the spiritual value must enter into every text which we in the New Church come to deal with. It is not necessary that the natural and the spiritual purposes should have been the same, in the giving, and the development, of the Word. Rev. John Worcester quotes Swedenborg to this effect, where he says: "Though very few understood or knew that their words signified heavenly things of the Lord's kingdom and church, still, being touched and penetrated with the awe of admiration, they felt that what was Divine and heavenly was in them" (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1756) ("The Word as the Son of Man," p. 86). The guard we

must be on against losing this, is evident in these words of a critic (W. G. Jordan, in *Old Testament Canon*, *A New Standard Bible Dictionary*): "The words of early prophets and poets in the moments of enthusiasm had a suggestion of the 'divine'; and before it became the subject of scholarly study, the written Word had its own magic and mystery."

In all our studies we shall have to bear in mind the ordinarily surprising fact that Swedenborg did not appear to find the imperfections in the literal sense any hindrance to exposition of the perfectly meaningful spiritual sense. As examples we have Amos 3:12, where he supplies a word (to make sense and to serve the spiritual sense) which no other translator gives, not found in the text of the original that we have; and in the case of the figures of the dimensions of the bronze sea (I Ki. 7:23), wherein the circumference given is not geometrically accurate for the diameter given, he says (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 5291), "This was (given) in order that holy things might be signified as well by the numbers ten and five, as by thirty; which number of the circumference does not indeed geometrically answer to the diameter, but still it spiritually involves that which is signified by the compass of that vessel." At n. 3703 of the "*Arcana*" he gives the spiritual sense as the cause of Abraham instead of Isaac being called, in a certain text, Jacob's father. At 2 Sam. 6:6, 7, where Uzzah puts forth his hand to steady the ark, and is smitten, he says that "hand" is omitted from the Hebrew to spare the shock to the angels against such profanation as that pictures (*ibid.*, n. 878). We will see him gathering spiritual sense out of meaningless natural sense in the Prophets, as see "True Christian Religion," n. 226; and find him comparing results with the Word in Heaven (*Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, n. 97 e, etc.). And the matters to consider will be many.

On the other hand, we have him at "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 95, refraining from giving the spiritual sense of the parenthetical words "but thou art rich" on the ground thus put: "These words are also added, 'but thou art rich,'

but in a parenthesis, because in some copies they are omitted." Here he seems to have warrant in Schmidius, who has these words distinguished both by parentheses and italics—as is his custom where words are missing from some manuscripts, as, e. g., Mtt. 4:1. Where the authority rested, with Schmidius, and with Swedenborg, is matter for further search. The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, in its article on the Bible Text, says that there are four codices containing the Apocalypse complete, and one having some small gaps. The complete are: 1. Codex Sinaiticus, 2. Codex Alexandrinus, 3. Codex Vaticanus, 4. Codex Ephraemi; and the one with lacunae, but otherwise said to be especially good of the Apocalypse is Codex Porphyrianus (a 9th cent. palimpsest). It is said that the Apocalypse appears in its oldest form in Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi, to which Porphyrianus comes nearer than Vaticanus. (See Vol. 2, pp. 102-3.) Possibly others will yet come to light. Finality seems hardly the word for these days. Yet, if the manuscript with these words missing lay before us, we should still have the question to study, of why Swedenborg spiritually interpreted those words in writing the "Apocalypse Explained," which he did not publish, and refrained from doing so in the "Apocalypse Revealed," which he published. Plainly our food is not all pre-digested. However, it requires more than one fact to prove a law, and we present the plea for study of this, and similar problems—and not for any "bolting" of hasty conclusions. Indeed, cultivation of the habit of a thoroughly judicious mind may be our greatest need just now.

And, further, we would be reminded that these problems are not new discoveries, just now for the first time brought before the New Church; but that they were all (and more of them than we have touched upon in this report) dealt with more than a century ago by such students as Noble, and Bush, and Hindmarsh, and Tafel. They were not settled then; but the studies then made were a contribution. We may not settle them now; but the studies which we

ought to make should also be a contribution farther on the way of rational satisfaction in things spiritual. We hope it may be.

Some mention should here be made of the standing of the New Testament text. And we do not believe we can do better in short space, than to submit the following from the New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia (see article on Bible Text) :

"The object [of textual criticism] is to ascertain which among two or more variations of the text presented by our MSS., or other authorities, is the original. No kind of evidence, external or internal, is to be neglected. The problem is to be solved by a process of reasoning upon probabilities; and what has to be considered, in every case, is which hypothesis will best explain all the phenomena. This fact is sometimes partially stated under the form of the rule that that reading is to be accepted as genuine which will best explain the origin of the other variations. This is an important rule; but there must be taken into account not merely the nature of the variations, but the number, independence, and character of the witnesses that support them. The process of criticism is not a mechanical one. Authorities must be weighed, not counted. One good, very early manuscript may be worth more than a thousand copies derived from a late and corrupted archetype. Yet mere antiquity does not prove the excellence of a copy." In regard to this the New Standard Bible Dictionary, in article on New Testament Text, says, "A late manuscript may have been copied from a very old one, and contain a text better than that of an older manuscript that happens to be extant." Returning to Schaff-Herzog, we are presented with Bengel's great rule, viz., that, "The more difficult reading is to be preferred," which "applies to those variations which are to be ascribed to design." The New Standard Bible Dictionary illustrates this principle thus: "For example, in Mk. 1:41 the reading 'aroused to anger' (found in MS. D) is

more likely to be original than 'being moved with compassion,' because later reverence rejected the more human touch." (We cannot pass this by without asking what ground the context gives for any "human touch" of that type? For this is the text: "And there came a leper to Him, beseeching Him. . . . And Jesus, moved with compassion [or (?) aroused to anger], put forth His hand and touched him, and saith unto him, I will: be thou clean.") Another rule given by Herzog is: "The shorter reading is to be preferred."

On the results we have this:

"The host of various readings which an examination of ancient MSS. versions and quotations, has brought to light, perhaps 150,000 in number, alarms some simple-minded people. Analysis at once dispels the alarm. It is seen that a very large proportion of all these readings, say nineteen-twentieths, are of no authority, no one can suppose them to be genuine; and nineteen-twentieths of the remainder are of no importance as affecting the sense. Of how much, or rather of how little importance, for the most part, the remainder are, can readily be seen by comparing the Revised Version of the New Testament (with its marginal notes) with the text of the Authorized Version, or by an examination of the chief modern editors in Scrivener's *Novum Testamentum, textus Stephanici* A. D. 1550 . . . *accedunt variae lectiones* 8th ed. Cambridge, 1877. The great number of various readings is simply the result of the extraordinary richness of critical resources. Westcott and Hort remark, with entire truth, that, 'in the variety and fulness of the evidence on which it rests, the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachably alone among ancient prose writings.'"

To much the same point are these words from Kenyon's "Textual Criticism of the New Testament" (introductory chapter): "After matters of just transposition are eliminated, there remains about one one-thousandth part of the original text that is in doubt."

This one one-thousandth part we must here leave to further study.

We wish to say, in closing this report, that time has made it out of the question to enter into a thorough analysis of the subject matter here gathered; what we have tried to do has been, first, to let testimonies of authorities speak for themselves; and second, to point, by a few examples, to what we consider the necessary New-Church approach to the matter that textual scholarship brings before us.

EVERETT KING BRAY.

SWEDENBORG AND HUMAN HISTORY.

BY JOHN R. SWANTON, PH.D.

FROM the earliest age of man until his own time Swedenborg held that there had been four great periods characterized by religious developments which he denominated churches. These were the Most Ancient, the Ancient, the Jewish, and the Christian churches; and the periods covered were respectively from the creation of man to the "Flood,"—by which is meant a spiritual and not a natural cataclysm; from the Flood to the call of Abraham and the end of the Egyptian bondage; from that time until the coming of Christ; and from the coming of Christ until Swedenborg's own era. He speaks of these four periods as constituting so many parts of a cycle which he likens to the diurnal and annual cycles marked out by the position of the earth relative to the sun; and he considers each of the four periods as of the nature of a cycle within a cycle. Perhaps this fourfold division of the cycle may be called rather a truism than a hard and fast classification, because any period in history may be divided into that part which was most typical, phases of approach to and recession from the typical stage, and a negative stage when as a whole it had ceased to exist, and was replaced by others. And so we find that Swedenborg gives us not only a fourfold classification, but also a sixfold or a sevenfold classification. (See *Coronis*.)

As might have been expected, the coming of Christ is made a critical event in the major historical cycle; and the time at which it occurred might be said to correspond to midnight in the diurnal period, or the winter solstice in the annual period.

Next to this event, which with Swedenborg is cosmic, stand two others, one a Second Coming of the Lord in his

own time in an unfoldment of the mysteries of the spiritual world and the Word of God, and the dawn of a continuing era of human enlightenment and spirituality; the other an earlier critical event indicated symbolically by the "Flood," when the most interior of all of the past churches was brought to an end. Whatever may be thought of the later periods here indicated, they are familiar to us and are historic. It is the earlier stages which require particular study.

I have indicated that the break between the Most Ancient and the Ancient churches was greater than that between the Ancient and the Jewish, because Swedenborg implies as much, and because what he says of these churches tends to prove it. Indeed, the Jewish Church is at times treated as if it were not a true church at all, but a mere semblance of a church. The true Ancient Church, apart from the Jewish, he divides into two: the Ancient Church proper; and the Second Ancient Church, which was confined to Syria and the neighboring countries, and was known as the Hebrew Church from its supposed eponymous ancestor. These two and the Jewish Church he sometimes describes as a first, second, and third Ancient Church, and he goes on to characterize each: the worship in the first as from a knowledge of correspondences, i.e., a knowledge of the spiritual meaning or soul of each material thing, and reverence for it wholly on that account; the worship in the second as based upon reverence for material things, because it was known that they had spiritual correspondences; and the worship in the third as based upon reverence for the things themselves, after the real reason for such reverence had been lost. This explains the origin of idolatry, and, in part, the necessity for a written Word and finally the Incarnation, to the end that the religious attitude toward these might take the place of the religious attitude toward material objects, and thus its first object be ultimately restored.

The several periods in the Ancient Church thus represent so many stages of decline,—of a disappearance of the knowledge of the spiritual meanings of things. The wor-

ship of all of these was secondary, that is, derived from others. Their knowledge of spiritual things was either taken from writings or accepted orally through tradition. The interior knowledge of the Most Ancient Church, on the other hand, was primary. It was a personal possession of each individual, founded on an ability to read at once the spiritual meaning of each object in nature, to perceive the soul of which the object was an external expression. In other words, this was a subjective church, an intuitive religion, one to which we may return again when we have rediscovered the spiritual world as a whole, and have re-identified the spiritual meaning of each object and process in the material world about us. This will explain the importance attached by Swedenborg both to the "Flood," in which the perceptive faculty of the Most Ancients disappeared, and to the Second Coming of his own time, in consequence of which this faculty (or knowledge) is to be restored. They are the autumnal and vernal equinoxes of the spiritual year; the sunset and sunrise of the spiritual day.

So different was the religion of the Most Ancient Church from that of the churches intervening between it and the future New Christian Church, which will resemble the Most Ancient Church in fundamental respects, that Swedenborg employs distinct names for them. He calls the former "celestial" and the latter "spiritual." A celestial church is one in which the individual perceives truths without reasoning regarding them, and also perceives and performs his duties in any situation in a similar manner. A spiritual church is one in which the individual learns both truth and duty by the study of facts and the transmitted teachings of the Church and the Word. The actions of a celestial man spring from love; those of a spiritual man from knowledge. Also, the actions of the celestial man spring primarily from love to God, and derivatively from love to the neighbor or charity; while the actions of the spiritual man come from knowledge that the neighbor is to be served, and that God

is to be loved. In speaking of the New Christian Church now coming into being as celestial, I do not mean to characterize its present state, but the level which it will reach when its latent possibilities come to full fruition. John's vision of it was as a perfect spiritual church in form (its walls were of jasper) but as a celestial church in content (the city itself was of pure gold).

Swedenborg's choice of the terms "celestial" and "spiritual" was perhaps because the former is from *coelum*, "heaven," and heaven has always been a common synonym for God, and in general for the inner in accordance with which the celestial man acts (see *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 162), while the latter is from *spiritus*, "breath," and the breath is from the lungs, which correspond with things of the thought or understanding.

One other matter is to be mentioned. The terms "celestial" and "spiritual" are often employed relatively for periods in the world's history; or for periods in the life of man; or for objects in which love or the will on the one hand, or wisdom or the understanding on the other, is peculiarly in evidence. In what follows, it will be important to keep in mind these two uses of the terms "celestial" and "spiritual."

Now let us see what Swedenborg tells us of the earlier periods through which humanity has passed. From what has gone before, we are prepared to learn that the Most Ancient Church was the best of all that have existed hitherto (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 414). It was formed originally out of men who had been living like the wild beasts before there was any church at all upon earth (*ibid.*, n. 286). These were the "Pre-Adamites" (*Spiritual Diary*, n. 3390). But after the Most Ancient Church had been constituted, its internal was the good of love, and its external the good of mutual love or charity (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 6367). Its members worshipped the Infinite Esse and the derivative Existere or Divine Human (*ibid.*, nn. 4687 and 5663) in one God whom they named Jehovah (De

Verbo, II). They enjoyed a tacit internal breathing in harmony with heaven (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 3892); everything they saw seemed to them as though it were alive (*ibid.*, n. 920); they spoke with the angels by means of correspondences (*Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture*, n. 21); and they were also instructed by means of dreams (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1976). Thus they had immediate revelation and no written Word (*De Verbo*, II). They worshipped in tents (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 414) and on mountains (*ibid.*, n. 796); and, as might have been expected, they did not practice animal sacrifice (*ibid.*, n. 2180) or circumcision (*ibid.*, n. 4462). As to their manner of life, we are informed that they lived in tents associated in least, larger, and largest groupings, which Swedenborg calls "houses," "families," and "nations" (*Conjugal Love*, n. 75, *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 414, *Apocalypse Explained*, n. 709); that they set up stones as boundary marks (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 3727); that most of them were shepherds (*Apocalypse Explained*, n. 799); and that they lived on bread made of wheat, and on milk and butter (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1002). We are also informed that "before letters were invented" (presumably Swedenborg means the Phœnician alphabet) the people of the Most Ancient Church had a system of inflective writing (*Heaven and Hell*, n. 260).

At its very end the men of this Church held that God had transiused himself into men (*True Christian Religion*, n. 470). As is the case with man in general, they were born into the voluntary (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 6367), and *they* could be regenerated as to the voluntary; but toward the end of that Church the voluntary was destroyed, and hence those of the Ancient Church which succeeded could not be regenerated as to the voluntary, but only as to the intellectual (*Diarium Minor*, n. 4711; *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 7124), though a new voluntary was created (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 4493).

It is evident that the term Most Ancient Church is to be used in a more extensive sense and in a less extensive sense,

both chronologically and geographically. The dual use of the term as applied to its temporal succession is shown in the following quotation from the opening of Swedenborg's exposition of the internal sense of chapter II of Genesis:

The first three chapters of Genesis treat in general of the Most Ancient Church which is called "Man" (*homo*), from its first period to its last, when it perished: the preceding part of this chapter [Chap. II, verses 1-17] treats of its most flourishing state, when it was a celestial man; here it now treats of those who inclined to their Own, and of their posterity. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 137.)

The dual use as applied to its geographical extent is indicated by the following excerpts:

Be it known . . . that when any church becomes no church, that is, when charity perishes and a new church is being set up again by the Lord, this is effected rarely if ever with those with whom the old church has been; but with those with whom there was no church before, that is, with the Gentiles. So was it done when the Most Ancient Church perished; for then the new church called "Noah," that is, the Ancient Church which was after the flood, was set up among the Gentiles, that is, among those where there was no church before. (*Ibid.*, n. 2986.)

This posterity of the Most Ancient Church [when it had begun to decline] was not disposed to dwell alone, that is, to be a celestial man, but, like the Jewish Church, desired to be among the nations. (*Ibid.*, n. 139.)

Besides this [Ancient] church, there were other churches also at that time, as that which is called "Enosh," and others also of which no such mention and description is extant. Only this church "Noah" is here described, because it was of another and entirely different nature from the Most Ancient Church. (*Ibid.*, n. 640.)

From the last sentence it is plain that these "other churches" were of the Most Ancient type; and I think what is said about the initiation of the church "Noah" among people who had never belonged to a church should not be taken to mean that they had never had any religious beliefs, but only that they had not belonged to a radiant center of Divine revelation.

The radiant center of the Most Ancient Church was, at

least in part, in the Land of Canaan (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3686); and from this fact the places there derived their sacred, correspondential character (*ibid.*). Remains of them continued in Palestine, including the Rephaim, Nephilim, and Anakim (*ibid.*, nn. 4454, 6588), but "especially among those called Hittites and Hivites" (*ibid.*, n. 4447), and specifically with Hamor the Hivite and his son Shechem (*ibid.*, nn. 4448-4454, 4476). It is also said that the people of the Copper Age in general were their descendants (Continuation of the Last judgment, n. 77), and that rituals observed in the Land of Canaan were derived from theirs (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4581).

While the Most Ancient Church had no sacred writings compiled for its own use, some of its wisdom, particularly that in regard to correspondences, was collected by those represented by Cain and Enoch, and preserved for posterity, i.e., for the use of the Ancient Church. This is said by Swedenborg to have taken the form of a writing (Apocalypse Explained, n. 728).

Therefore the Lord provided that some of these who lived with the most ancients should collect the correspondences into one, and should connect them together into a writing. These were they who were meant by "Enoch"; and this writing is what is there signified. As this writing was to be of service to future Churches . . . for the knowledge of spiritual things in natural ones, it was preserved by the Lord for their use, and also guarded, lest the last posterity of the Most Ancient Church should injure that writing. This is what is signified in the spiritual sense by "Enoch was no longer, because God took him." (Apocalypse Explained, n. 728; also see Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5136.)

But, as above stated, the most ancients mentioned by Swedenborg do not seem always to have been those living in very remote times. Thus we read:

This method of writing was customary in the most ancient times, not only among those who were of the church, but also among those who were outside the church, as among the Arabians, Syrians, and Greeks, as is evident from the books of those times, both sacred and profane. (*Ibid.*, n. 9942.)

Indeed, we are given to understand that people similar to the most ancients have continued to the present day; for Swedenborg says that "the Africans are they who in our earth are of the genius in which are the angels in the Celestial Kingdom." (*Spiritual Diary*, n. 5518.)

The end of the Most Ancient Church is represented in our Bible by the great Flood. Spiritually this means an inundation of falsehoods resulting from evils of life, but on the material plane it signifies the extinction of the Most Ancients as a people, or at least as a Church (*Arcana Cœlestia*, nn. 799, 800). That the churches which now succeeded down to the coming of Christ were all distinct from the Most Ancient Church, and in some manner related to one another, is shown by the following quotation, already alluded to:

There were three Churches that are specifically mentioned in the Word, namely, the first Ancient Church which was named from Noah, the second Ancient Church named from Heber, and the third Ancient Church named from Jacob and afterwards from Judah and Israel. (*Ibid.*, n. 1327.)

And from several assertions that the Ancient Church was precisely like the Christian Church in internals, differing only in externals (*Ibid.*, nn. 1083, 4772). Something has been said already regarding the differences between these churches in their understanding of truth, but the two following quotations will make the matter clearer:

With the man of the Most Ancient Church there was ground in his voluntary part, in which the Lord inseminated goods; hence from goods he could know and perceive truth, or from Love have faith . . . [For] the man of the Most Ancient Church had revelations, by which he was initiated from infancy into the perception of goods and truths; but, as they were inseminated into his voluntary part, he perceived without new instruction innumerable things, so that from one general, he knew from the Lord the particulars and the singulars, which men now have to learn . . . and even so can know scarcely the thousandth part, for the man of the spiritual church knows nothing but what he learns. (*Ibid.*, n. 895.)

Decline of the knowledge which this Church enjoyed is thus described:

The Most Ancient Church, which was celestial, looked upon all earthly and worldly, and also bodily, things, which were in any wise objects of the senses, as dead things; but as each and all things in the world present some idea of the Lord's kingdom, consequently of things celestial and spiritual, when they saw them or apprehended them by any sense, they thought not of them, but of the celestial and spiritual things; indeed they thought not from the worldly things, but by means of them; and thus with them things that were dead became living. The things thus signified were collected from their lips by their posterity, and were formed by them into doctrinals, which were the Word of the Ancient Church, after the flood. With the Ancient Church these were significative; for through them they learned internal things, and from them they thought of spiritual and celestial things. But when this knowledge began to perish, so that they did not know that such things were signified, and began to regard the terrestrial and worldly things as holy, and to worship them, with no thought of their signification, the same things were then made representative. Thus arose the Representative Church, which had its beginning in Abram, and was afterwards instituted with the posterity of Jacob. (*Ibid.*, n. 1409.)

Among the things said of the people of this Ancient Church are the following: They acknowledged the Lord, and called Him Jehovah (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1343). They worshipped on mountains, because these signified celestial things of worship, and in groves, because they signified spiritual things (*ibid.*, n. 2722); also in gardens and under trees according to their significations (*ibid.*, n. 10644) and in temples (*Apocalypse Revealed*, n. 585). They composed books having an internal sense (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1540). They knew that fire was representative of Divine Love (*ibid.*, n. 6832); and they understood by the "sun" the Lord, but the solar rites they initiated degenerated into sun worship (*ibid.*, n. 2441).

As in the case of the Most Ancient Church, we are also informed that "there are some now who are as it were of the Ancient Church" (*Spiritual Diary*, n. 1987). Originally this Church existed among the historic peoples and empires of the Old World, particularly those of Asia; and it is stated that all of the people of the Iron Age drew their

worship from the Word which they possessed, and which Swedenborg calls the Ancient Word (Continuation of the Last Judgment, n. 77). This Ancient Word is said to have consisted of certain books mentioned in the Old Testament in several places, "The Wars of Jehovah," "Enunciations," and "The Book of Jasher" being named; and it is said to be preserved in Great Tartary (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 11; True Christian Religion, n. 279; Spiritual Diary, n. 6077; Coronis, n. 39).

Finally this church, like its predecessor, originally centered in the Land of Canaan for the sake of the representative characters of the objects and places there which had become incorporated into the religious thought of mankind (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 5136, 6516).

So much for the early history of man as outlined by Swedenborg. That described by paleontologists and archeologists appears at first quite different. According to their findings man evolved from mammals, either from some type of anthropoid, or along a stem which separated from the anthropoids at an early period. He appeared either in the latter part of the Miocene epoch of the Tertiary period, or in the succeeding Pliocene. Absence of the higher apes, man's nearest relatives, and absence of remains of ancient man in the Western Hemisphere, have led to the belief that his birthplace was not in the New World; but in what part of the Old World he arose is uncertain. Central Asia, Southern Asia, North Africa, and Western Europe, all have their advocates. There is also considerable difference of opinion regarding the earliest relics of human beings. The flint objects which have been found in Pliocene deposits, and attributed to human workmanship, the so-called "eoliths," are not accepted as genuine relics of human industry by many archeologists, though certain types are favorably regarded by a considerable number. The earliest skeletal remains, including the famous Java man (*Pithecanthropus erectus*), Piltdown Man (*Eoanthropus*), and Heidelberg Man (*Homo Heidelbergensis*),

have occasioned wide discussion. While most paleontologists now consider them all human, there is much difference of opinion as to the position that should be assigned them on the human family tree, the greater number holding that they are not on the direct line of modern man's ancestry. When we reach the Quarternary period and the Pleistocene epoch, however, we are on firmer ground. We have, in the first place, a series of flint artifacts of admittedly human workmanship, and these differ in type sufficiently to enable us to distinguish a number of periods, called in succession from bottom to top, Pre-Chellean, Chellean, Acheulian, Mousterian, Aurignacian, Solutrean, and Magdalenian, besides the Azilian, Tardenoisian and some others which were transitional to the Neolithic Age or Age of Polished Stone. This last is in turn separated into a number of periods, and following upon it come the ages of Copper, Bronze, and Iron. Flints of the Pre-Chellean, Chellean, and Acheulian epochs succeed one another by regular gradations; those of the Mousterian epoch are quite clearly differentiated from them; and those of the Aurignacian, Solutrean, and Magdalenian from these in turn; and therefore this Old Stone or Paleolithic Age is often divided into Lower, Middle, and Upper, the Middle including the Mousterian. Mousterian man is also the first one of whom we have clear knowledge, because the makers of the Mousterian implements are identified as belonging to a peculiar human species now passed away, one with protruding orbital processes, a stooping gait, and certain other clearly defined characters, but still with very good cranial capacity. Judging by the few traces of man which have come down to us from still more remote times, it is generally supposed that this was also the prevailing species of man in the earlier Quarternary epochs. At the end of the Mousterian period, this human type (*Homo Neanderthalensis* as it is technically called) suddenly disappears, and varieties of man belonging to the modern species (*Homo sapiens*) take its place. One of these, the famous Cromagnon man, had a

splendidly shaped skull, and a brain capacity above the average. It must be remembered, however, that high cranial capacity does not prove high mental capacity. We need not enter into a discussion regarding the various types of man which succeed. It is sufficient for our purposes to know that between the Middle and Upper Paleolithic periods one species of man goes out and another comes in.

Domestication of animals and cultivation of plants come with the Neolithic or New Stone Age. Writing appears in the Copper and Bronze Ages; and the Semitic or Phoenician alphabet, from which came that of Greece, Rome, and the modern civilized nations, is known to have been devised about 2000 B.C. in the Sinaitic peninsula.

The findings of paleontologists and archeologists thus seem to differ from the views of Swedenborg in a number of important particulars. Waiving the question of human evolution, which we are not here called upon to discuss, the first point of difference that confronts us is in the chronology. All modern students of the subject believe we have proof of the presence of man on this earth for several hundred thousand years, and many of them push the figures into the millions. On the other hand, it seems that Swedenborg, like his contemporaries generally, conceived of human history as extended over a few thousand years only. This matter is, however, of minor importance. It is the quality of the prehistoric ages that interests us particularly, not their quantity.

Secondly, from the point of view of paleontologists Swedenborg appears to have had an inadequate idea of the succession of human cultures. While his Pre-Adamites correspond in some measure to the earliest men as conceived by anthropologists, the Most Ancients who followed them are represented as shepherds and either cattle-raisers or goat-herds, who also engaged in agriculture, at least to the extent of raising wheat. They had some sort of property in land, because they set up stones as boundary marks; and, more remarkable still, they had a system of inflective writing.

Swedenborg seems to imply that this last was used before the invention of our alphabet; but the earliest ideographic writing of which we have any knowledge does not carry us back further than five or six thousand years B.C. That would still be five thousand years or more after the cultivation of plants and the domestication of animals had begun; and back of that stretches the long, long ages of hunting and food-gathering for several hundred thousand years more. Our so-called period of civilization is to the whole stretch of human existence as two days to the remaining three hundred and sixty-three in a year. How can we synchronize Swedenborg's Celestial Age with human acquirements so widely scattered in time? With some plausibility we might consider the food-gathering stage of man as that of Swedenborg's Pre-Adamites, and assume that his Most Ancient time began with the opening of the Neolithic Age. But, in the first place, Swedenborg seems to imply that his Pre-Adamites existed for a very brief period; and it is difficult to understand what purpose in the Divine economy could be served by postponing the initiation of a Church among men for so many thousands of years. Secondly, in the Middle Paleolithic period we have clear indications of religious beliefs, in the regular burial of the dead and the deposition of food in the graves; and there could hardly have been religious observances before there was a Church (cf. *Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 931). Thirdly, in the Neolithic Age we have evidence of the existence of shamans, indications of sun worship, and in somewhat later times of human sacrifice, suggesting types of worship which could with difficulty be classed as celestial.

Another interpretation of the facts appeals to me as meeting the demands of the situation more adequately. I would place the Celestial Age in the food-gathering period (a truer designation than a hunting period), and would assume that it extended through much of, perhaps most of, the Pliocene Epoch, possibly including also a part of the Miocene, and the early part of the Pleistocene. Of course, we cannot

know the spiritual condition of these people,—a matter that bulks so large in Swedenborg's description of them,—and consequently we cannot apply that test of the correctness of our views; but the sudden disappearance of one type of man and emergence of another at the end of the Middle Paleolithic corresponds rather remarkably with what Swedenborg tells us of the end of the Most Ancient Church and the beginning of the Ancient. This would date the end of the Most Ancient phase of human existence between 25,000 and 50,000 B.C.

But if we accept this solution, we must explain the appearance of cultural elements like sheep-herding and cattle-raising, farming, and a system of writing, which did not make their appearance until several thousand years after the last of the Mousterians had vanished.

In this connection I have two suggestions to offer. First, I think we must learn to read Swedenborg (the same principle would apply to many another writer) in such a manner as to differentiate from his own thought the material quoted, directly or indirectly, from the thought-furniture of his time. Thus his general conceptions of the soul-life of the race may have been quite correct, but he may have clothed them in imagery such as the writers of his time were wont to employ in similar situations, representing their conceptions of the accessories necessary to the event. The picture he draws is of a semi-nomadic culture similar to that in Palestine in patriarchal days, and such as is still found, or was until recently, on the edges of the Arabian desert, where Semitic tribes have intruded far enough into the "fertile crescent" to have added a primitive agriculture to their pastoral pursuits. This was, indeed, the characteristic life of the early ages of Israel,—*its* celestial stage if you please; and it is a manner of life often pictured in former times as "the simple age of innocence."

Secondly, I think we may explain much of Swedenborg's imagery regarding the Most Ancients which does not accord with the purely food-gathering period of mankind, by the

fact that many pastoral and semi-pastoral people of later times reflected something of the celestial stage. Indeed, a closer examination of Swedenborg's texts than I have been able to give them may show that the terms "Most Ancient" and "Ancient" had with our author a qualitative rather than a chronologic use in some of those situations which create the most difficulty. I have indicated such a possibility already.

Be that as it may, the identification I have given of Swedenborg's Most Ancient and Ancient periods seems to encounter the fewest difficulties. It has the double advantage of extending the religious experience of mankind over practically the whole of human history and of providing the sudden replacement of race which is called for at the end of the supposed Most Ancient era.

When we turn to consider the Ancient Church, we are met by other difficulties arising from the alleged method by which the knowledge of the Most Ancients was transmitted to them, and from the form it subsequently took. We are told that some of the knowledges of the Most Ancient Church were collected by those called Cain and Enoch, and preserved for the benefit of the Ancient Church, and that they subsequently became the basis of the Ancient Word,—the Bible of that second dispensation. This is quite possible, if we assume that the material was preserved as ritualized traditions; but Swedenborg says distinctly that the people of the church called Enoch collected "the correspondences into one," and then connected these together into a "writing." Is Swendenborg speaking again in accordance with the imagery of a later day, or are we to suppose that even the Most Ancients made use of certain mnemonic characters or "picture writings" to aid the memory? The earliest suggestions we have of anything of this nature are markings on pebbles found in deposits of the Azilian epoch, the very close of the Paleolithic Age. But this was many thousand years after the disappearance of Neanderthal man,

the event which I have regarded as marking the end of Most Ancient times.

Personally I do not believe that anything that may properly be called writing existed at the time in question; and we do not know that any sort of mnemonic system was in use; yet I think it is possible to understand what actually took place without resorting to either supposition, if we look at the whole question in a broad way. We must remember that we are dealing with people who have had and are having personal experiences of both the material and the spiritual worlds, and of the relations existing between them. They no more need to be told about correspondences than grown men of our day need to be told how to walk. But certain groups of individuals who have in course of time withdrawn themselves from spiritual things, wish to make up for the dimming of their spiritual faculties by some sort of record of the interior things. One kind of record is the symbolic story, in which the persons and things have names corresponding to what is spiritual, and in which they perform actions corresponding to spiritual processes. Stories of a similar character are popular today among primitive people everywhere, and would doubtless soon become popular among others whose personal experiences of the realities portrayed were no longer sufficiently vivid to be more interesting than such stories. As these stories were handed down, they may indeed have become altered; but under Divine Providence the alterations may have been so adapted to the new generations of mankind to whom they had been transmitted as to leave the essential spiritual values uninjured. It is true that Swedenborg tells us that these knowledges were not for the Most Ancients but for the Ancients. We may suppose that among the declining Most Ancients perception still existed alongside of symbolic stories, and that it was the constant effort of Providence to restore this perception, the symbolic story representing a perversion of the higher faculties of the celestial men. But after the destruction of the Most Ancients, and the total

withdrawal of perception, what had before been disorderly now, under the Divine Providence, became a means of building up a new revelation, indirect it is true yet the best possible for the type of men among whom the new (i.e., Ancient) church had to be established. Even had there been a system of writing at all comparable to those which exist today, I think it extremely doubtful whether for the length of time demanded it would have been possible to preserve a book not in regular use. I make these suggestions for what they may be worth, and pass on to the next difficulty.

This is the problem presented by what Swedenborg tells us of the Ancient Word and the three books, the "Wars of Jehovah," the "Enunciations," and the "Book of Jashar." By all modern critics these three books are regarded as sacred writings of the Israelites themselves. The Gore Commentary calls the Book of Jashar "an old collection of folk-songs of early Hebrew victories," and a "collection of early Hebrew poetry." Moreover, one of the poems incorporated into the Book of Jashar is David's lament over Saul and Jonathan, the Davidic authorship of which J. F. Stenning, in the Gore Concordance, says "there is no good ground for doubting." In the same way Joshua's famous apostrophe to sun and moon to stand still, which was "written in the Book of Jashar," is considered as part of a song composed to celebrate the victory of the Israelites and Gibeonites at Beth-horon.

As before, I ask the reader to approach the consideration of this problem from a broad point of view. If the Ancient Church began 25,000 to 50,000 years B.C., the compilers of its sacred writings were not thinking of Hebrew victories more than 23,000 years later. Their spiritual strivings could hardly have been aided by future events of this character to them unknown. On the other hand, the writings in question do belong within the Ancient period. As we have seen, Swedenborg sometimes treats the Israelitish Church as the last phase of the Ancient Church. Further-

more, it seems evident that the three writings under consideration antedated all the principal narratives of the Old Testament. The compilation of the oldest of them, the Jahvistic narrative, is usually assigned to the ninth century B.C., distinctly later than the time of David; and it is very possible that the bulk of the material constituting the lost books was much older, as that referring to the victory of Joshua certainly was. From the fact that quotations from them were included in the inspired Word, we know that they had a spiritual sense. Remembering that the Jewish Word was not completed until toward the end of the Jewish Church, two or three centuries B.C., we need not be surprised if the more ancient revelation was not completed until a short time before the beginnings of the later one. For, whatever its position, the writings under discussion are in the period of the Ancient Church. It is true that the fragments we have seem to come from the heroic age of the Israelites; but one, if not both, of those which are given in Numbers seems to refer to events which happened before the Children of Israel reached Palestine, and they all comprise happenings near the closing period of the Ancient Church proper. It is also important to remember that this closing period belongs to what Swedenborg calls the Second Ancient Church, or the Hebrew Church. Now, the Israelites really constituted a group of tribes of the larger Hebrew body; and the sacred literature of all of them was probably shared in considerable measure. In short, the three writings may very well have been the specific form which the Ancient Word took in the Hebrew Church, and material may have been added to it by the tribes of Israel, as a constituent part of the Hebrew nation down to the kingship of David, with whose conquests the Israelites emerged from among the struggling Hebrew tribes as an independent and dominant people. The last reference we have is in connection with David's Song of the Bow, unless we accept the Septuagint note at the end of Solomon's prayer.

But beyond all this these extracts have a like archaic

character, and the miracle performed at Joshua's bidding is in keeping with the spirit of the greater part of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, which Swedenborg attributes to a similar origin. He also tells us that the Book of Job is a work of the Ancient Church containing correspondences, and he quotes from it in several places. Finally, the Song of Solomon, though not a sacred writing, is defined as written in the ancient style.

If we read what Swedenborg says about these writings carefully, and examine them for ourselves, we shall find that he has in mind a symbolic style of utterance and a semi-mythic treatment of events. Thus he says:

That the book of Job is a book of the Ancient Church is evident . . . from the representative and significative style therein. (*Arctana Cœlestia*, n. 3540.)

The Song of Songs . . . is not among those [writings] called "Moses and the Prophets," because it has not the internal sense; but it was written in the ancient style, and is full of significatives gathered from the books of the Ancient Church, and of many things which in that Church signified celestial and spiritual love, and especially conjugal love. (*Ibid.*, n. 3942.)

In fact the Song of Songs has been the subject of numerous mystical interpretations. Both this work and Job are now assigned a much later date than was common in Swedenborg's day; but when we say that, we mean the final form of the composition, as the materials entering into each may have been considerably older. In fact, there is a Babylonian story similar to that of Job which antedates it by several centuries. Swedenborg more often speaks of this style as the style of the Most Ancient Church than that of the Ancient, because it derived its origin in the first instance from that Church. Nearest to it among later styles was that of the prophets, and this formed a link with the historical style found in the early books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, the two books of Samuel and the two books of Kings, which perhaps should be called the Jewish style, though Swedenborg nowhere uses that term.

Still another problem as to this Ancient Church is created by Swedenborg's assertion, on spiritual authority, that in

his time its sacred writing, the Ancient Word, was still preserved in "Great Tartary." We shall find it useful to examine and compare his successive statements regarding this. The first reference seems to be in the "Spiritual Diary," n. 657. After relating various particulars concerning the people of that country, Swedenborg remarks, "They said that they have a book, their possession of which is not known elsewhere, which they called a Divine Book, and which they read and are instructed by, and which they understand. Inquiry was made, and it was the Psalms of David . . . They have the decalogue also." This is repeated in the "Last Judgment" (Post.), n. 133, which is dated 1762.

We should expect to find something more about these people and their book in the "Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture," written in 1763; but Chapter XII, which treats of the Ancient Word and quotes passages from it incorporated into the Hebrew Scriptures, closes without mentioning its continued use anywhere on earth. Such mention reappears, however, three years later in the "Apocalypse Revealed" (n. 11), written in 1766. While the earlier references speak simply of "Tartary," and in one place in the "Spiritual Diary" the name "Lesser Tartary" is used, there can be little doubt that the same country is intended. Now, however, we find that the sacred work of these Tartars was the Ancient Word with its three books. A substantially identical account is given, in part or in whole, in "Conjugal Love," n. 77, "True Christian Religion," nn. 266, 279, and "Coronis," n. 39, written in the years 1767 and 1771. We must suppose either that Swedenborg found his earlier information as to the identity of the sacred writing preserved among the Tartars to be incorrect, or that they possessed both.

Some years ago I published an article in the REVIEW in which I took the ground that the country corresponding most closely to the description Swedenborg gives is Korea. Tibet is oftenest mentioned by New-Churchmen, because of

its aloofness and the known dominance of religion in the lives of the people there; but Tibet never was properly a part of Great Tartary, it is not populous, it cannot be described as outside of the Great Wall, and the emperor of China at the time when Swedenborg wrote was not from Tibet but from Manchuria, close to the Korean border. In neither country, however, do we find a religious work in use corresponding very closely to what Swedenborg says of the Ancient Word. Buddhism is the prevailing faith in Tibet, as are Buddhism and Confucianism in Korea; but I know of no Buddhist or Confucian work in any way resembling the one in question. It has been thought that this ancient Word might be preserved in some obscure monastery or other repository of documents in the region; but Swedenborg plainly represents it as the sacred volume of a populous people, who based upon it their faith and ritual.

In order to place our understanding of this Asiatic dispensation in a clear light, we must first premise what Swedenborg tells us regarding the origin of all religions outside of those of the Jews and Christians.

That from the most ancient times there has been religion, and that everywhere the inhabitants of the world have had knowledge of God, and have known something about a life after death, has not originated in themselves or their own penetration, but from the ancient Word . . . and, at a later period, from the Israelitish Word. From these two Words the things of religion have spread into the Indies and their islands, and through Egypt and Ethiopia into the kingdoms of Africa, and from the maritime parts of Asia into Greece, and from thence into Italy. (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, n. 117.)

All these religions, then, have been derived from the central dispensations in and about Palestine, and Swedenborg thinks of them as passing by three main routes, one eastward through Asia to the East Indies and Oceanic Islands, and also into the West Indies, i.e., America; a second into Africa via Egypt and Ethiopia; and a third into Europe through the Phoenicians, Cretans, and Greeks. Similar courses were taken by Judaism and especially by

Christianity in later times, except that they did not reach America or Oceania through Asia, nor the more remote parts of Asia and Africa by the land route, as must have been the case with the older dispensations, but by sea from Europe. Before the great age of European expansion, however, Christianity had been introduced into western India, China, and Abyssinia; and Judaism had extended nearly as far. We must assume that the same process had gone on, though in a more leisurely manner, with the older churches. In fact, we know that civilization moved westward into Europe at least as far back as the beginning of the Neolithic period, and probably earlier; also that civilizing influences have spread over Africa from its northeastern corner. Asia has received much of her culture from her southwestern extremity. India and China have, it is true, possessed independent civilizations from very early times; but both the Aryan and the pre-Aryan or Dravidian cultures of India sprang up in the northwestern part of that country, and were probably affected more or less by the civilizations of the fertile crescent. Chinese civilization is generally traced to the northwestern provinces, and is thought to show traces of contact with the Neolithic culture of western Asia and southeastern Europe. There is every reason to believe that America was not populated until after Middle Paleolithic times; and there is no proof that it was occupied prior to the Neolithic Age. If the Ancient Church was then in existence, as I have supposed, beliefs drawn from it would be carried into America by the immigrants, and become the bases of the religion of the civilized nations of the New World,—the Toltecs, Maya, Quechua, and Yuncas.

According to Swedenborg's statements, therefore, all of the religions of the Asiatics, Africans, and Europeans, as well as of the Americans—except such as reached them from the Hebrew Scriptures—came from the Ancient Word, whether a Word containing the Wars of Jehovah, the Enunciations, and the Book of Jashar was preserved or

not; and the problem is fairly laid before us to examine the sacred writings of Asia in order to see what traces of this Ancient dispensation they may contain. Lest anyone be shocked at the suggestion of inspired books among the oriental religions of our own day, let me call attention to the following:

It was told me that there is a book among the Mohammedans which is common in their hands, in which some pages were written by correspondences, like the Word with us; from which pages there is some light in the heavens. (Last Judgment (Post), n. 98, *Spiritual Diary*, n. 5809.)

When Swedenborg wrote, little was known of the sacred books of the East. Anquetil du Perron did not publish the "Zendavesta," which he had brought from India, until 1771, a year before Swedenborg's death; and the great writings indigenous to India itself and to China were not introduced to the western world until after the foundation of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta in 1784. The apparent identification of passages in our Bible with passages in the writings of people from Great Tartary is difficult to explain; but it must be remembered that Nestorian Christians settled in the province of Shen-si in 631 A.D., and maintained themselves in the country at least until the thirteenth century, while a Jewish colony was established in 1163, which preserved its autonomy until very recent times. Of this Jewish colony we read that "they were visited in 1850 by a Protestant mission, which succeeded in obtaining from them Hebrew rolls of parts of the Pentateuch in the square character with vowel points." That Nestorian influence extended to the territories north of the Great Wall is proved by the fact that the Mongol and Manchu alphabets were both derived thence. Their presence is also thought to have been responsible for the mediæval legend of Prester John. The presence of the Psalms of David would thus be readily accounted for, though not of the Ancient Word as understood by Swedenborg. It is, however, interesting to know that in just this region influences from the west were most

active. Not only were Christianity and Judaism introduced here, but also Mazdaism and Manichæism. The alphabet extended even as far as Korea, though the Korean alphabet seems to have come through Tibet and India.

Swedenborg also tells us of a Word preserved from early times in another continent. Mention has already been made of a celestial-minded people in Africa. As far back as the time when the "*Arcana Cœlestia*" was being written (1747-1753), Swedenborg speaks of the Africans in heaven as "the most loved of all Gentiles" (n. 2604, and similar references in Heaven and Hell, n. 514, and Last Judgment, n. 51, both written in 1758). In the "*Spiritual Diary*," n. 4774, we learn that a new revelation was being made among the Africans; and more about this, and about the people who were receiving it, is given in nos. 4777, 5515-5518, 5946. Much of the same information is repeated in the posthumous work on the Last Judgment, written in 1762, nos. 116, 118, 124. Other references are in the "*Continuation L.J.*," n. 76, written in 1763, and in the "*True Christian Religion*," n. 840, written in 1771. From this material it appears that the African Church was being established in Abyssinia and the Hamitic countries immediately south of it. Mention of a sacred writing or Word among them is made in the "*Spiritual Diary*," n. 5809, and in "*Last Judgment (Post.)*," n. 121. In the latter it is stated that this had been preserved among them from ancient times; but from a passage in the "*Spiritual Diary*," n. 5946, it would seem that this was identical with our own Word, which of course *was* preserved by Abyssinian Christians from the early days of the faith, while the Old Testament was also preserved by the Jewish tribe known as Falashas. The parallel passage in the "*Last Judgment (Post.)*," n. 123, appears to differ from this in making the Abyssinian Word distinct; but the "*Spiritual Diary*" statement corresponds with the facts as we know them. In the same way we are able to account for the Psalms mentioned in "*Last Judgment (Post.)*," n. 122, "written in a style similar to

that of our Word," which they sing in their temples. Swedenborg was informed by spirits from that region that they had been so scandalized at the teachings of missionaries from Europe that they had either driven them out or sold them to Asiatics. This reminds us of the expulsion of the Portuguese priests in 1633, which took place after they had enjoyed a considerable degree of favor. From that time until the English traveler Bruce reached Ethiopia in 1769, the only European to visit the country was the French physician C. J. Poncet, in 1698. What future, spiritual and material, may be in store for the peoples of Africa through this Ancient Kingdom of Ethiopia we do not know; but the courage its inhabitants have shown, first in maintaining themselves against the Mohammedans by whom they were cut off from other Christians for centuries, and later against the aggressions of those Christians themselves, indicates that they are possessed of some of the rugged virtues which make the best of foundation for a rugged faith.

It is interesting to find that Swedenborg attributes certain spiritual attributes to the inhabitants of some of our great land masses taken as a whole, and shows that these differences have come about in the course of religious evolution. Until the time of Christ Palestine was a radiant center for the spiritual enlightenment of man. The Most Ancient or Celestial Church, in keeping with the character of things celestial, contained relatively few subdivisions; but aside from the early profusion of cults indicated by the nations descended from Noah, which are enumerated in the tenth and subsequent chapters of Genesis, the Ancient, Jewish, and Christian churches, as they spread outward from Palestine, seem to have taken on separate forms in at least the three major continents of the Old World. We are told that "when Africa is mentioned, the angels perceive the east" (*Apocalypse Explained*, n. 21); and there is where Swedenborg locates his present-day celestials, and where he speaks of a new revelation as taking place, the

forerunner perhaps of the new celestial epoch among men. "When Asia is named, angels perceive the south . . . because the church was there in ancient times, and then extended over many regions there; therefore, those who are in heaven from that country are in the light of intelligence" (*ibid.*). And we have also seen that the Ancient Word, the Word of the spiritual church, or at least of dispensations from it, were perpetuated in the very center of that continent. When Europe is mentioned, they perceive the north (*ibid.*); and there, when Swedenborg wrote, was the old Christian dispensation. May we suppose, though he does not say it, that America corresponds to the west? If so, what is the meaning of that revolution by which it has ceased racially to be an appendage of Asia, and has become an appendage of Europe,—or is perhaps making Europe an appendage to it? Shall we still further flatter our already overgrown national self-conceit with the thought that this marks a spiritual revolution, and that the basis for a new spiritual growth is being laid in our western world? At least let us temper our vanity with the reflection that a basis is at the bottom.

Hitherto we have found it necessary to modify some of Swedenborg's views to accord with modern findings; but we now come to a point where we must do the exact opposite. A recent scientific work intended for popular consumption contains one chapter entitled "Eden or Evolution," in which "Eden" is made to refer to special creation and is placed in antagonism to evolution. If we confine ourselves to the raw statement of special creation in Genesis, this antagonism is indubitable; but the conception of a stage in the life of primitive man which might be called the Golden Age, one represented in the popular mind by the Garden of Eden, is another matter. As we have seen, Swedenborg holds that there was such a stage, and that "the fall of man" had a real meaning. It is quite essential to his philosophy of history, indeed to his entire philosophy; yet it is foreign to the scientific thought of our own day.

Against it may be cited the archeological record which shows a relatively uniform improvement from early paleolithic (or if you please eolithic) times until now, and the skeletal material which exhibits, upon the whole, a most decided approximation to simian types the farther back we go.

But before proceeding let us try to understand what we mean by a Golden Age, and what by a "fall." Emphatically we do *not* mean by the former an advanced state of civilization; nor do we mean an age in which mankind was of a highly evolved physical type,—one that would be called beautiful as tested by the canons of our own day. For that reason neither the argument from artifacts nor that from skeletons has any special validity. Swedenborg's conception of the relation which the individual bears to the race recalls the recapitulation theory in biology,—the hypothesis that the individual repeats, or tends to repeat, the stages passed through by his ancestors. Thus he considers that there was a correspondence between the infancy of an individual and the infancy of the race, between the youth of an individual and the youth of the race, between the manhood of an individual and the manhood of the race, and so on. In one place in the *Arcana* he ventures to give the successive periods in the individual life.

Man's first state is from birth to the fifth year of his age, this state . . . is called infancy; the second state is from the fifth year of age even to the twentieth, this state is a state of instruction and of science, and is called childhood; the third state is from the twentieth year of age to the sixtieth, which is a state of intelligence, and is called adolescence, young manhood and manhood; the fourth and last state is from the sixtieth year of age and upwards, which is a state of wisdom, and of innocence in wisdom. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 10225.)

It will be noticed that there are four of these ages, and they correspond to the four ages of the earth represented by the four churches. There are two ages of innocence, the first and the last, and the period covered by the Most Ancient Church, or the Golden Age, corresponds to the infancy of a single individual. So far there is a rough

agreement between Swedenborg's view and that held today. Again, the anthropologist would warn one not to press the resemblance too far; and Swedenborg would agree with him. There is an analogy approaching to correspondence between the period of infancy and the age of the Most Ancient Church, but not an identity of experience. At this point, however, Swedenborg and the average anthropologist would part company. The latter would maintain that man as to his ethics, his morals, and his religious beliefs, as well as his industries and arts, has advanced slowly and, upon the whole, steadily in one direction. Swedenborg would hold that man has indeed advanced steadily in one direction, but that this advance has been accompanied by profound changes involving an actual fall, if not in ethics and morals, at least in ethical and moral standards. In this I believe that the facts now tend to bear Swedenborg out.

In the first place, the attitude of the average anthropologist is governed by the idea that man evolved from the animal by a great number of minute changes, during which he almost imperceptibly put off animal characteristics and put on human characteristics, and that there were stages when he might be defined as animal-man or man-animal. Now, while I concede the possibility that such *might* have been the appearance to an onlooker sufficiently long lived to view the whole process, I do not believe that the real change was effected so. Man, wherever we find him, has certain quite definite characters, moral and mental as well as physical, and I think the burden of proof is on anyone who proposes to deny that they have not always been characteristic of him. Of course there are minor physical differences which seem to have been acquired since he departed from his earlier stages; but I am speaking of the salient characters by virtue of which man is man and not animal. My belief is that man made his appearance in a single mutation—or a single mutation in several related individuals—and that the strictly human characters began to show themselves very early. Although I have no doubt that man

arose from the animal—that man was incarnated into the animal might be a more correct statement of the occurrence.—I believe that the actual gulf between the mind of man and the mind of animal was as great at the beginning as it is today, though naturally the latent possibilities of the human mind required time for their expression. It is probable that there are now no intermediate forms, simply because such forms are not, as the geneticists say, “viable,” and never were. This is not a denial of intermediate forms in the direct ancestral line, but they would be few, since the human genetic complex would soon express itself in strictly human external characters.

Secondly, in spite of the relatively steady cultural advance of man, temporary degeneration, particularly in his moral standards and æsthetic productions, is a common phenomenon. At times there was even an industrial decline. Thus many scientists who believe thoroughly in consistent cultural evolution, are wont to deplore the recession of Greek learning; and students of the history of science are almost obliged to skip a thousand years, from the second or third century of the Roman Empire until the Renaissance, before they are able to resume the thread of their narrative. At a somewhat later period the civilization of Germany was nearly destroyed by the Thirty Years War; and indeed the rise and fall of culture has been a recurrent phenomenon throughout the entire course of human history. Although not as readily traced, the rise and fall of moral standards and moral practices is just as certain. As such fluctuations have been common phenomena in the historic period, we have every right to assume that they took place in earlier times also.

Finally, religion, and moral standards more or less intimately bound up with religion, are found wherever we find men; and there is every reason to believe they are part and parcel of the human complex. Religion and language are the most distinctive and characteristic of human possessions; and in these two particulars we know of no inter-

mediate forms, no missing links. Some form of religious faith has been found in practically every extant family and tribe belonging to the human race, the few exceptions cited from time to time having usually been taken out of that category on closer examination. It could hardly be otherwise when traces of a belief in immortality have been detected in the Mousterian period ending fully 25,000 years ago. On the other hand, the religious sentiment has never been detected in a single animal form below man.

Reflect upon the full significance of this! It means that after millions upon millions of years during which organic life had evolved, always in close adaptation to the material world about it, an organism appears, known on other grounds to be more highly endowed than any of its predecessors, which boldly declares that it is not limited to the material universe, and that though its connection with matter will be severed in time, it will live on. At the same time this creature claims to know that this universe of matter is really controlled by Mind analogous to its own, and that in that Mind the true reality dwells. It is childish to explain these ideas as pathological. They are not characteristic of diseased minds or of declining civilizations, but of the world's noblest and best. Moreover, unless we are to assume that "creation's crowning work" is completely diseased,—a contention which his success hardly bears out,—no excuse for such a belief is to be discovered in the material world as revealed to us by our ordinary senses. All attempts to account for it by a system of "natural evolution" from dreams, shadows, reflections, and so on, collapse, because no one can explain why such phenomena should not be taken at their face value, as is done by the lower animals.

In brief, the only really simple, rational explanation of belief in continuance of life after death and in the overlordship of Mind, is that these conceptions are true. And if they are true, it is equally certain that they have originated in direct experiences of them at some time and in some manner. In other words, our universe is dual; but

man is the only being conscious of this duality, probably because he alone is capable of existence in both parts of it.

Today such belief in an interior world as people happen to have they adopt from others. That few have immediate personal experience of it, is probably due to the fact that most do not really believe in it, while some allow themselves to become so enmeshed in interests, thoughts, and emotions inspired by material things that no time is left for anything else. Moreover, many are diseased; and those who are not sick in body, yet suffer from interior mental disorders which effectively block up communication with that world. Such communication probably exists with some psychics, but usually distorted and unhealthful because they surrender their personalities to "controls" instead of retaining their freedom and the unimpaired use of their faculties.

It is natural to suppose that when mankind first emerged from the animal condition, the upper stories of his mind, as well as the lower ones, were in order; and, granted man has this contact with the superior world, there is every reason to suppose that it was more vivid and perfect then than after his interests had been attracted and *distracted* by the grosser, but more clearly sensed, material environment. This distraction probably produced the first differentiation between the religious leaders and the common people, the former either degenerating in time into the shaman, medicine man, and sorcerer, or giving place to the priest, after the reality of the spiritual world had ceased to be a general experience, and had become mainly a belief. And in course of time religion became a fainter and fainter echo of that experience, until it was completely transformed and perverted, its custodians themselves even becoming atheists, or, what was far worse, commercializing the religious sentiments of the masses for purely selfish ends.

Such an origin of religion is, I believe, better grounded, that is, more scientific, than any naturalistic origin that has been suggested. We must suppose that, when mankind made its appearance, the human mechanism was more perfect than it is today; because, whether one believes in the

doctrine of natural selection or not, man had been more rigidly adjusted to his environment up to that time, than he now is. If we add belief in a merciful and all-guiding Providence, we shall be willing to admit the probability of a period of interior perception, and of ordered living in accordance with it, such as mankind has not since experienced. At the same time it must be remembered that this represented only one stage in the greater life of man, and that it corresponded to the age of infancy, when virtue is such spontaneously and not as the result of victory over the temptations induced by an age-long disordered human mechanism. Therefore there was a certain inevitability in this fall of man (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 161); and man may look forward to a time when he will reach an even higher moral and physical level than that through which he passed in Eden. Thus the present scientific ideal of an ascending evolution is not unjustified. But science is unwilling to recognize that the upward curve of the arc has been preceded by a downward curve in man's psychic life. In recognizing the downward curve also, religion, even in its corrupt form, exhibits a true instinct, and has a real contribution to make to science. Until the two are brought together, the real "story of man" will not have been told.

Admitting this Golden Age, the other periods as characterized by Swedenborg, both in descent and ascent, follow almost as a matter of course. The only difficulties are incidentals due in great measure to historical uncertainties. That he was not able to see all of the meanings contained in the letter of Scripture, or appreciate the meaning of the Ancient Word in its entirety, or the purely natural significance of the Egyptian hieroglyphs, is not strange, and will be forgotten when the true nature of his work is understood. It was not his task to investigate the astronomical, geological, biological, or anthropological history of this planet of ours, to unravel its cultural problems, or to determine the origin and evolution of the several sacred texts, but to open the road to those interior levels which contain the significance of all the rest. JOHN R. SWANTON, PH.D.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF THE FLAG OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA*

BY MAURICE WORCESTER TURNER, M.D.

FLAGS, standards, ensigns, have been used from the earliest times. The Egyptians, Assyrians, and Persians, all had standards formed of such objects as then inspired in the minds of men feelings of awe and devotion. The North American Indians carried poles tipped with eagle's feathers; and other savage peoples have had similar customs. The Chinese, Dacians, and Parthians, among others, used a dragon as a military sign. The Greeks bore various emblems, according to their respective nations; while the military signs of the Romans were important, and had a direct bearing on the history of heraldry. Figures of animals, as the wolf, horse, bear, etc., were borne; and not till after the time of Marius (157-86 B. C.) did the eagle become the standard of the legion. The Roman soldier swore by his ensign; and it was not unusual for a general to order it to be cast into the ranks of the enemy, to add zeal to the onset of his soldiers, by inciting them to recover what to them was perhaps the most sacred thing the earth possessed.

The Dragon Standard.—Many of the flags borne on the lances of the knights of William the Conqueror's army are shown in the Bayeux Tapestry. They are of different sizes and shapes, some with personal and some with allusive devices. The dragon-standard appears among them near Harold the Saxon King. For the meaning of this dragon-standard we

*Read at the meeting of the New-Church Club, Boston, Wednesday, February twelfth, and also, with suitable additions (incorporated herein), at the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Tuesday, March fourth, 1930.

have to go back to the legendary kings of Britain, to King Arthur (501-542) and even earlier—King Arthur of the Knights of the Round Table fame, who has been immortalized in Tennyson's "Idylls of the King."

King Arthur's father was Uther, son of Constans. Geoffrey of Monmouth adds the surname of Pendragon, which is really a military title, and means "dictator" in Welsh,—from *pen*, head, and *dragon*, leader. There were said to have been two Pendragons, brothers, Uther being one. Uther Pendragon (465?-510?) had a vision of a flaming dragon in the sky. He called the wise men to interpret his vision. They told him that it meant that he was to mount the throne. When he became king he had two golden dragon-standards made, one of which he always took into battle. This may explain why the dragon-standard is near Harold in the Bayeux Tapestry.

Standards of France.—The ancient Kings of France bore the blue hood of St. Martin on their standards. St. Martin (316?-396?) was Bishop of Tours, and is regarded as the patron saint of France. He is said to have divided his hood (it meant a cloak then) with a beggar, after which he saw and heard, in a dream, the Lord in heaven telling the angels about his good deed.

After the blue hood of St. Martin came the oriflamme, originally the banner of the Abbey of St. Denis. This was of red silk, cut in points at the fly, and mounted on a golden staff. Probably from the derivation of the word there was a golden tinge to the red, (Latin, *auriflamma*,—*aurum*, gold, *flamma*, flame).

In the fifteenth century came the white standard powdered with fleurs-de-lis. This gave place to the imperial standard, which was blue, bearing a gold eagle, and powdered with golden bees. The tricolor was introduced at the time of the Revolution.

The Origin of the Cross of St. George.—The flag of the British Empire combines the crosses of St. George, St. An-

drew, and St. Patrick.* The red cross of St. George, on a white field, is said to have originated during the crusades, about the year 1100, though St. George was martyred in Cappadocia in 303 A. D.

There are stories of wonderful happenings during the crusades; of dreams and revelations from heaven which were eagerly listened to. This suggests that the leaders found it necessary to stimulate in every possible way the courage of the crusaders who were in desperate straits. For example, a Lombard priest had learned in a vision that the third year of the crusade would see the conquest of Jerusalem. Others also had been assured that in five days help would be given them.

It is related that Peter Barthelemy, the chaplain of Count Raymond of Toulouse, said that in a dream, or in a vision, he was told, by St. Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, to dig in the church of St. Peter, at Antioch, where had been hidden the spear-head which pierced the side of our Lord as he hung on the cross, and that the recovery of this lance would be followed by immediate and decisive success in battle. Two days were to be spent in devotion, and on the third they were to search for the spear-head. The night came, and the digging was for a long time unsuccessful. Finally the priest stepped into the pit, and with a few strokes of the spade uncovered the holy relic, which was wrapped in a cloth of silk and gold; and he held up the lance-head to view. There was, of course, great rejoicing; but the authenticity of the relic being questioned, some weeks later, by Arnold, chaplain of Bohemond, Peter demanded the ordeal by fire to support his contention. This he went through successfully, much to the joy of the multitude, and the confounding of his accusers. Unfortunately Peter died a few days later from injuries received in the trial. In the meantime the holy lance, borne by the papal legate, Adhemar, Bishop of Le Puy, had aided

*The Cross of St. George is the Greek cross, with vertical and horizontal parts; the Cross of St. Andrew and that of St. Patrick are alike in shape, that of an X.

the crusaders in battle; and the alternative—of baptism, or retreat from a land which St. Peter had bestowed upon the Christians—being submitted to the enemy by Peter the Hermit, and refused, the battle was again joined, the Christians being sorely pressed.

It was at this point in the battle of Antioch that an infinite number of heavenly soldiers, all in white, led by St. George, St. Maurice, and St. Demetrius (some accounts substitute St. Theodore here) on white horses, with their standards, descended from the mountains, and turned seemingly certain defeat into victory. The Bishop of Le Puy, on perceiving them, exclaimed, "There are they, the succours, which in the name of God I promised you!" However much truth there may be in these tales, the fact remains that the battle of Antioch (1098) was a great victory for the crusaders. There was a great slaughter, one hundred thousand of the enemy horse, besides foot soldiers innumerable, are said to have perished, and vast stores fell into the hands of the Christians, Jerusalem being recovered. Just before the final assault on Jerusalem, St. George was supposed to be seen again, on the Mount of Olives, dressed in white, on a white horse, waving his shield; and the cry went up, "St. George, the martyr, has again come to help us!" St. George was then accepted as the patron saint of England, Aragon, and Portugal.

The Cross of St. Andrew.—For several centuries before this, from about 740 A. D., the patron saint of Scotland was St. Andrew, brother of St. Peter. He suffered martyrdom in the year 69, perhaps on an oblique cross like that which bears his name. In 330, Regulus, one of the Greek monks to whom the remains were entrusted, fearing from a dream that the Emperor Constantine was going to remove the body to Constantinople, took part of the bones, and, after a stormy voyage, escaped to Caledonia, that is, Scotland. Here he built a church for the glory of God and for enshrining the relic.

The Cross of St. Patrick.—St. Patrick (372?-460?), whose cross is the third on the British flag, was born in Scot-

land near where Glasgow is now. He died in his bed at about ninety years of age. Though his cross is on the flag, he was not a martyr, and is said never to have been canonized; so that a cross in his honor is in defiance of all ecclesiastical usage and custom. However that may be, there are other explanations of the origin of this cross which carry it back to the Norman invasion of Ireland. The red cross on a white field was the heraldic device of the Geraldines, and was carried by Maurice Fitzgerald, the grandson of Rhys, the great King of South Wales, when about 1169 he landed in Ireland at the invitation of the King of Leinster. The cross was then held up to the people as that of their patron saint.

Other Flags.—Other flags have allusive devices or charges. The Russian flag, for instance, displays a cross of St. Andrew; but instead of being white on a blue field, as on the British flag, it is just the reverse, that is, a blue cross on a white field.

Many flags use the red, white, and blue: as the French Tricolor, of which I will speak later. The flags of the Netherlands, of Paraguay, and Luxemburg, have three horizontal stripes of red, white, and blue.

The flag of Hawaii, curiously enough, has on its canton the three crosses of the British flag, and carries eight stripes of white, red, and blue, in that order from above down, horizontally on the field. It is the only American soil over which now floats a canton similar to that on the "Grand Union Flag" of the Colonies in 1776, which was without the cross of St. Patrick, having only the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew on the canton.

The "Grand Union Flag."—The "Grand Union Flag," which was hoisted January 1, 1776, over General Washington's headquarters on Prospect Hill, Somerville, Massachusetts, indicated that the Colonies had at first no desire to separate from the Mother Country. The rancor of the Revolution, and later irritating incidents between the two countries, having passed, we can now realize fully the community

of interests between the British Empire and the United States of America for the good of humanity.

Liberia copied the American flag,—which, of course, is a compliment,—except that there are but eleven red and white stripes, while the blue canton has only one large white star.

An interesting flag is that of the Third Maryland Regiment. This flag was said to have been carried, during the Revolution, at the battle of the Cowpens in January, 1778, and is identical with the first flag authorized by Congress on June 14, 1777, with thirteen stars in the blue canton and thirteen red and white stripes. Sometimes this flag is pictured with a ring of thirteen stars; and again with a ring of twelve and the thirteenth in the centre. Many of our state flags use red, white, and blue.

The Flag of Massachusetts.—The flag of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts bears on a white field the coat-of-arms of the State, which is a blue shield with an Indian, etc.; and on the reverse of the flag there is also a blue shield, which bears a green pine tree.

In the State Council Records of Massachusetts, under date of Wednesday, December 13, 1780, there is the following:

Ordered, That Nathan Cushing, Esqr., be a Committee to prepare a Seal for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; who reported a device for a Seal for said Commonwealth as follows, viz.: *Sapphire*, an Indian, dressed in his Shirt, Moggosins, belted proper, in his right hand a Bow, *Topaz*, in his left an Arrow, its point toward the Base, of the second; on the Dexter side of the Indian's head, a Star, *Pearl*, for one of the United States of America.

Crest, On a wreath a Dexter arm clothed and ruffled proper, grasping a Broad Sword the Pommel and Hilt, *Topaz*, with this motto, *Ense petit placidam Sub Libertate Quietem*.

This means that the Indian, dressed in shirt, hunting-breeches and moccasins, with bow and arrow, are of gold; the star with five points is of silver; the crest, a wreath of blue and gold, and the right or dexter arm, clothed, bent at the elbow, is also gold. The motto is most interesting. It is the second of two lines written by the English patriot, Algernon Sydney, about 1659, A. D., in the Book of Mottoes in the

King's Library at Copenhagen, Denmark. The Provincial Congress adopted it in 1775. It was intended as a message to England, and was said to be a peaceful one,—but how could it be? The two lines are:

*"Manus haec inimica tyrannis
Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem."*

This may be translated as follows:

"This hand, inimical to tyrants,
By the sword seeks peaceful quiet under liberty."

The two lines remind one of the cry in the Senate House at Rome, when Julius Caesar was slain—"liberty, freedom, tyranny is dead!" This is as Shakespeare (1546-1616) wrote it; and he wrote it about the time of the Pilgrim escape to Holland (Amsterdam 1607, Leyden 1609), and of the Puritan unrest.

Wordsworth expressed the English—or, better, Anglo-Saxon—longing for freedom thus:

We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
That Shakespeare spake, the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held.

The Standard of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America.—The flag of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America is described as follows:

The standard of the Order shall be a field, argent, surmounted by a cross, gules; on a canton, azure, a constellation of thirteen stars of the first.

This means, if I read it correctly, a cross of St. George, red, on a white field, with the blue canton with thirteen white stars. This canton with the stars was first displayed on the flag of June 14, 1777, the result of the First Flag Act by the Continental Congress. This standard carries us back to the Mother Country from which the ancestors of many of us came, and thus refers happily to the colonization of this country by Englishmen; as the cross of St. George was the only cross permanently on the British flag then, and the blue canton with the thirteen stars alludes to the thirteen colonies

which achieved independence. This then is the significance of the standard of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America. Its symbolism is most appropriate and complete, as the cross of St. George and the blue canton with the thirteen white stars stand for or recall certain times and events.

The Flags of the United States.—The flags of the united colonies were very various before and after the Declaration of Independence; and even after the introduction of the Stars and Stripes these underwent many changes in the manner of their arrangement, before taking the position at present established.

Our flag is said to be the third oldest national flag in the world.

On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress passed the First Flag Act, establishing the Stars and Stripes as the flag of Our Country. It was as follows:

Resolved: That the flag of the United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

As nothing was said as to the number of points on the stars, these have varied, sometimes being five-pointed, more frequently six-pointed, and often eight-pointed. The five-pointed star, one point upward, is an ancient symbol of authority, and also a sacred symbol in Christian churches.

The early flags carried the number thirteen in many ways: as in the thirteen stripes or thirteen stars, with which we are familiar; and sometimes as a knot tied with thirteen cords; or, on the union, as thirteen horizontal stripes alternately of blue and silver.

The Making of the First American Flag.—The story of the making of the first American flag by Betsy Ross is fairly well authenticated. According to tradition, a committee comprising General Washington, Robert Morris, and Colonel Ross, uncle of Mrs. Ross's husband, called on her, and asked if she would make a flag from a drawing they brought. At her suggestion General Washington revised the drawing, and from that she made the flag.

The Arms of the Washington Family.—Benjamin Franklin is credited with advising that the stars on the flag be adopted from the Washington family coat-of-arms, which are as follows :

Arms,—Arg.: two bars, gu.; in chief three mullets of the second.

Crest,—On a wreath, gu. a Raven with wings indorsed, proper, issuing out of a ducal coronet, or.

Motto,—*Exitus acta probat*, "The outcome justifies the deeds."

To explain, the shield is white with two red bars horizontally on the lower two thirds. Across the upper part, or chief, are three red five-pointed spur-wheels, shaped like five-pointed stars. Now a mullet is a figure in shape like the rowel of a spur, used as the filial distinction of the third son; so in this case they were not stars. Crest,—a raven, black, with wings on back springing out of a golden ducal coronet; all on a red wreath. Note that the bars and mullets are all red, on a white field—no blue. The flag may have been evolved from this coat-of-arms; if it were, we are additionally proud of it.

The Star Spangled Banner.—The flag that floated over Fort McHenry, in the war of 1812, when Francis Scott Key wrote the "Star Spangled Banner," had fifteen stars and fifteen stripes, because two states had been added to the Union,—Vermont in 1791, and Kentucky in 1792,—and the Second Flag Act of Congress, January 13, 1794, which was approved by President Washington, provided for fifteen stripes and fifteen stars. Several other states were admitted before 1812, but no change was made in the flag. From 1795 to 1818 there were fifteen stripes and fifteen stars; from 1818 on there were thirteen stripes, and a star was added for each new state, the rule being that a star is added on the Fourth of July next following the admission of a state. Thus at the Revolution, and on the adoption of the Constitution, there were thirteen stars; in the wars of 1812 and with Barbary, fifteen stars; in the Mexican War, twenty-nine stars; in the Civil War, thirty-five stars; in the Spanish War, forty-five stars; and now, forty-eight stars.

The Labarum.—All flags are symbolic in that they are emblems or signs of past events or of wonderful things accomplished or hoped for. An instance of the last was shown when the Emperor Constantine displayed on his banner the flaming cross with the inscription "*In hoc signo vinces*," as a result of his noon-day vision. It was Constantine (272-337) also who adopted the labarum, the Roman military standard, which was borne before him after his conversion to Christianity. The name "labarum"—Greek *labaron*, standard—is said to have been derived from the Celtic *lavar*, meaning "word, sentence, command." It was so called by Constantine, as if it were a command of God in commemoration of his vision of the flaming cross. The labarum was a long pike with a cross-bar at the upper end; from that depended a silken veil upon which were wrought portraits of the emperor and his children. Above the cross-bar was a crown of gold enclosing the mysterious X-like cross, thus the Greek letter *Chi*, and running up through the X was probably the Greek letter *Rho*, that is R, completing the first three letters, *Chr*, or the monogram, of the Greek word "*Christos*."

It is suggested by some that the labarum, with its X-like form of the cross, is where both the crosses of St. Andrew and St. Patrick were derived.

Association and Contrast.—I have gone into the history and description of flags in general somewhat at length for two reasons: because of *association*, with which there were hints as to the evolution of our flag; and for the sake of *contrast*. As to *association*, I have recalled the reputed beginning of the crosses on the British Flag, and also the changes in the Flag of France that have gone on through the centuries.

The cross of St. George, often with that of St. Andrew, waved over this country many years. Even the Grand Union Flag, which showed the beginning of the Stars and Stripes, carried the canton which displayed both these crosses. Therefore the association was intimate. Added to this, there is

now on the flag of Hawaii the canton displaying the three crosses of the British flag. It seems appropriate to remember the manner in which these crosses are said to have originated, and the evolution of the flag of the British Empire.

Besides this we have the association of the French Flag in our war for Independence. Not, of course, the Tricolor, but the ensign which preceded it; i. e., the white flag of the Bourbons, said to be represented by the white on the Tricolor. We must remember that the aid of France was decisive in our Revolution, as was our help to France in the World War.

As to *contrast*, the Stars and Stripes displays no cross of a patron saint; it is not centuries old; neither is it the banner of any one man or family, royal or otherwise. It does, on the other hand, represent and perpetuate the history of the thirteen colonies which battled for freedom; and it also records the continued growth of the nation which they founded.

The Unrecognized Meaning of the Flag.—In the Flag History, prepared by the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Hon. Albert P. Langtry, is the following, giving the meaning of the flag:

The colors of the flag are red, representing valor; white, representing hope, purity and truth; blue, representing loyalty, sincerity and justice; and its stars, high aspirations and federal union.

This explanation of the symbolism of the colors, etc., is excellent; but there is a deeper meaning to our flag which does not seem to have been intended or realized by its designers, nor, as far as I can ascertain, ever to have been spoken of. This is what I call the *unrecognized meaning* of our flag.

The deeper signification of its colors and its stars adds much to its interest, and to its value as representing accurately the animus of Our Country; and what is more, I believe it makes it the only flag in the world which is correspondential, and certainly the only one whose correspondence is harmonious and complete.

A few words are needed here by way of explaining the

distinction between symbolism and correspondence. "Symbolism" is a word commonly used, and it is synonymous with "typify", meaning to employ things or terms in a figurative way so that they stand for something else, and are thus emblems or types. But correspondence means something more; with it there is congruity or agreement of natural things with spiritual things. To use simple illustrations: water, when clear and pure, corresponds to truth,—"truth lies at the bottom of the well." Fire from its brightness and warmth corresponds to goodness and love,—the warmth of affection. In a word, symbolism *may* refer, but correspondence *always* refers, to heavenly or spiritual things.

Heraldic Position.—We speak, and sing, of "the Red, White, and Blue." That is correct, as I will now explain. Let us take the colors in that order, remembering that the position of the colors on the flag is important in heraldry. Thus the position next the staff is more honorable than one remote from it, just as the upper part of the flag is more honorable than the lower. The red and white stripes, some of them, on our flag, begin at the staff, as does also the blue; while the other stripes, as well as the blue, are on the upper part of the field, therefore there is double honor for the red and white as well as for the blue. That is why we say "the Red, White and Blue," the blue including the stars. This is the correct way to read them in heraldry, and also the proper order correspondentially.

The Meaning of the Red.—We will take first the red, bearing in mind that in the spiritual world all colors are derived from red and white, as red corresponds to the Divine Goodness and Love, and white to the Divine Wisdom and Truth (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9467).

Red, which is warm and fiery, always suggests goodness, or what is synonymous here, love—the warmth of affection. The color of fire and its warmth, denote goodness. (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 9467, 9866; Apocalypse Explained, nn. 364, 1324; Apocalypse Revealed, nn. 231, 915.) This is the first of the colors of the flag, as is evident from its meaning, or

correspondence, and from its position on the field. "Red denotes the good of love—this from fire and blood which are red." (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 3300, 9866.)

The Meaning of the White.—The white stripes come next, from their position and from the correspondence of white, which from its purity signifies truth,—the truth of faith. Brightness denotes truth, because it is from the light of heaven (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 3301, 5317).

Goodness and Truth! These are the foundation correspondences of the flag, as they are the corner-stones of Christian character.

As Bacon says:

"There was never law, or sect, or opinion did so much magnify goodness, as the Christian religion doth."

Also: "No pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage-ground of truth."

And Chaucer: "Truth is the hiest thing that man may kepe."

Therefore how much we should rejoice if red and white,—goodness and truth,—can appropriately, and fittingly, represent our nation on its ensign!

But that is not all. We must consider now the blue canton and the stars, and wherein they are related to the red and the white?

The Meaning of the Blue.—Blue is the color which arches over us as we look up to heaven. Blue is a blending of black and white; and very likely the blue of the sky is due to the fact that we look through the bright lighted air to the black beyond. One often sees whitish smoke, against a dark background, looking blue. Black refers to our own ignorance and nothingness. Thus blue, composed of white and black, tells of truth—or wisdom—made more lovely to us by the realization of our own lack of wisdom; hence it denotes the love of truth, and consequently of goodness, for goodness and truth are always united, or should be. (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 9687, 9833, 9868, 9870; Apocalypse Explained, n. 1324.) Blue with purplish tinge, that is with red, denotes the cele-

tial love of good; while blue, lucid, whitish, the celestial love of truth. There are other shades of meaning also (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 9466).

The Honorable Position of the Blue.—The blue canton occupies the most honorable position on the flag; and the correspondence of the blue and the stars is most appropriate to that honorable position. What would goodness and truth be in the abstract? It is when we have an affection for them that they live. Notice how the stars fit into this meaning,—and also the number “thirteen,” when we come to it.

The Meaning of the Stars.—“A Star for every State, and a State for every Star!”* The blue canton with its forty-eight stars typifies the starry decked heaven, as well as referring to the forty-eight states in the Union! The stars are the next element we have to think of in the correspondence of the flag.

We have seen what the red and the white mean correspondentially, and the relation of the blue to them. How are the stars associated? The explanation requires a few words about the two great luminaries in the heavens.

The sun gives forth both heat and light; and on that account it is not difficult to see that both the sun and red are similar in meaning; that is, they signify goodness (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 5704; *Apocalypse Explained*, n. 401; *Apocalypse Revealed*, n. 53; *Divine Love and Wisdom*, n. 95). We know that the Lord appears to the celestial angels as a sun; and that they can receive from the Lord the purest affections and the wisdom that is associated with them. Consequently the sun corresponds to the goodness and love that angels and men receive from the Lord; particularly it denotes love. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, nn. 1053, 1521, 1529-30-31; *Heaven and Hell*, n. 118.)

The moon, on the other hand, has no light of its own, but reflects that of the sun. It gives but little heat; its light is cool and white, and for that reason it corresponds to truth,

*Robert C. Winthrop, address on Boston Common, 1862.

intelligence and faith. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4696; Apocalypse Explained, n. 401; Apocalypse Revealed, nn. 413, 414.) To the spiritual angels the Lord appears as a moon. They have less of love's perception than the celestial angels, and receive the light of truth in a cool intelligent way,—we may say in an intellectual way; so the moon, therefore, corresponds to intelligence. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 401; Heaven and Hell, n. 18.)

The myriads of stars do not reflect the light of the sun, as they are suns themselves, at almost inconceivable distances away in space. Though we know that many of them are many times larger than our sun, to us they appear to be small luminaries which shine in the night, and, as it were, emit into our atmosphere sparks of light; similarly to the way that knowledges emit those things that are of good and truth. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4697.) As the stars are not a part of our solar system, their relation is, we may say, from without. They are on-lookers, and may be supposed to be desirous to learn about our sun and moon; and having learned, they therefore denote knowledges of goodness, that is, of the sun, and of truth, that is, of the moon.

With the stars we come to the natural heaven, where the angels like to learn about the Goodness and Love, and Wisdom and Truth, of the Lord; but as they are in the least spiritual light, these things make comparatively little impression and are not well remembered; and so again, I repeat, the stars correspond to the knowledges of goodness and truth (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 2495, 5377, 7988; Apocalypse Revealed, n. 65).

A final word about the flags of the only two great nations of the old world which use the red, white and blue on their banners, those of Great Britain and France:

The Flag of the British Empire.—First, the flag of the British Empire,—the three crosses of St. George, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick on a blue field. This is of historical interest, and is symbolic, standing as it does for the wonderful and glorious deeds of Englishmen. Swedenborg spoke

of the "noble English nation"; with which expression I am sure we can all agree.

After the union of England and Scotland occurred, upon the accession in 1603 of James VI (1566-1625) of Scotland to the English throne as James I, the crosses of the two patron saints, St. George and St. Andrew, were, probably through his influence, combined in 1606 as the "Great Union." James wrote his name in French, "Jacques," and perhaps from that the flag came to be called the "Union Jack." However, the flag is only a "jack" when flown from the jack-staff of a man-of-war, and is then of small size. At the time of the Spanish Armada the English war-ships flew jacks of the cross of St. George; so the origin of the name "Union Jack" from "Jacques" has been questioned.

After the union of the two countries was dissolved, following the death of Charles I (1600-1649), the double cross was also done away with. Cromwell (1599-1658), on becoming Lord Protector (1653-1658), restored the union flag, and imposed the Irish harp on the centre. Charles II (1630-1685) removed the harp; and the double cross continued till the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland in 1801, when the cross of St. Patrick was also incorporated.

The Tricolor of France—Second, the Tricolor of France with three vertical bars of blue, white and red,—the red to the fly and the white in the middle. This has also much of historic value, and is symbolic of the famous achievements of her sons. It dates from the fall of the Bastille, July 14, 1789, and is said by some to have been developed from the cockade devised by Lafayette for the National Guard from the white flag of the royal family and the colors of the City of Paris, which have been red and blue for many centuries. It is said to go back to the times of Charlemagne (742-814) and Clovis (466-511). Others say that it combines the colors of St. Martin's banner, of the oriflamme, and of the white flag of the Bourbons; also that it was copied from the shield of the Orleans family, as it appeared after Philippe Egalité had dropped the fleurs-de-lis. Reading from the

staff, it is blue, white and red,—not the correct order, as in Old Glory; for red and white, as I have shown, are the fundamental colors, and the blue and the stars are related to them.

Flags of the Older Nations and Our Own.—It is perhaps evident now why I wished to contrast the flags of the older nations with our own. It can be said that they, the nations of the old world, have an advantage in their long history, and that their flags record it. This we may grant; but the fact remains that we all are descendants of these older nations, and so their long history is ours also. Our advantage lies in having a flag which, though comparatively new, has a glorious history of its own, and also a correspondence which no other flag can approach. The thought of the significance of our flag as regards goodness and truth should be a constant reminder of the obligations that the correspondence imposes,—*noblesse oblige!*

The Meaning of Thirteen.—There is something to add here, which we must not forget. What of the number thirteen? It was prominent in the beginning of the nation, with the thirteen colonies; and it has remained prominent on the flag, as the thirteen stripes, ever since. In spite of the popular superstition as to its evil omen, it has not been disastrous to the country; on the contrary, as the country has prospered, it must mean something good (*Arcana Cœlestia*, nn. 468, 530, 1050).

What of thirteen; what is its significance? It is easy to say that it is a combination of ten and three, but that does not explain its correspondence. Now, there is such a thing as states of affection for good and truth, heavenly states, which are implanted in men's memories during infancy and childhood, perhaps during the first ten years of life, when the infant or child is easily influenced; and, if in the infant or child, why not in the memory of the growing country?—for the nation is but the larger man! (*Arcana Cœlestia*, nn. 576, 1738.)

Captain Thomas G. Frothingham, in his address before the Society of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of

America on December 14, 1929, spoke of two influences for good which obtained in the colonial period: first, the division of the land; and second, the public schools. Were not these affections for things good and true which showed themselves, as it were, in the memory of the youthful nation? Add to this the meaning of three, which is fullness and completeness, that is, perfection; because, that anything may be perfect, there must be successive order of three (things or principles), as end, cause and effect; hence, as was said, three denotes not only what is complete, but also what is perfect. We then remember that there is only one perfect being; and so, that it has reference to the Divine. (Arcana Coelestia, n. 9625.) Thus we realize that the number thirteen denotes again the love of Goodness and Truth; only here this affection has been inculcated early in life from above, and is the foundation of, and the spur to, our good actions later. (Arcana Coelestia, n. 2109.) Can we not see this in the growth of our country, where there has been growth not only in material things, but, what is more important, also growth in love for our fellow men?

In relation to thirteen and its evil disposition, we may recall that on March 4, 1776, General Washington fortified Dorchester Heights, and thirteen days later, on March 17th, the British evacuated Boston. Of course, the thirteen in this case viewed from the other side has a different aspect.

My attention has been called to the thirteen letters in the motto of the United States, "*E Pluribus Unum*," and also to the thirteen letters in the word "Massachusetts," neither of which thirteens seems to be vicious.

Recapitulation.—To sum up,—the red stripes in our flag correspond to goodness and love; the white stripes correspond to truth, wisdom and intelligence; the blue corresponds to the love of goodness and truth; and finally the stars correspond to the knowledges of goodness and truth.

Putting these meanings together,—that is, the correspondence of the thirteen red and white stripes, and the blue with the stars,—we find that the knowledge and love of goodness

and truth, are the ideals for which our flag stands. An affection for these things, that is, for good and truth, is instilled in very early life both in men and nations. The corollary is, that this knowledge and love should be incorporated in the life, that is, put into practice; for affection alone is nothing, but it becomes something through the medium of use. (Doctrine of Uses, IX.)

Thus the correspondence of the flag of the United States of America is harmonious and complete. No other flag has a meaning of this kind, for no other flag has all these elements, —the thirteen red and white stripes, the blue canton and the white stars. Neither has any other flag this sequence of colors and stars, nor their important heraldic positions on the field.

The Star Spangled Banner is without a peer; it is unique!

“Freedom from her mountain height
Unfurled her standard to the air.”*

MAURICE WORCESTER TURNER, M.D.

*Drake, “The American Flag.”

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE POSITION OF URBANA UNIVERSITY IN THE THOUGHT AND LIFE OF THE CHURCH

Urbana University was founded by a small group of men who believed that New-Church thought and life are essential to the progress of religion and to the general welfare of the community. They designed an institution intended to give higher education in religion and in all departments of life. The charter provides for instruction in history, in the arts and sciences, in philosophy, and in that basis of all human life, the art of agriculture, as well as in religion. The first faculty was organized to carry out these provisions. There was an immediate response to the appeal which this educational program made. Students came from all parts of the country, and in a few years they numbered about 128. But inevitable difficulties were soon encountered. First of all, the school had no endowment, and lacked the money to employ an adequate faculty. The result was disappointment and dissatisfaction on the part of the large number of students in proportion to the size of the faculty. It was impossible in the nature of things for the small faculty to meet the needs and requirements of the varied student body. The natural consequence was that the numbers fell off year by year until the disturbances due to the outbreak of the Civil War brought practical suspension.

This was a failure in execution, but not of principle and purpose. Urbana University, through many vicissitudes and in the face of unyielding obstacles, has maintained its ideals, and has done what it could with the means at hand to express the ideals in its educational policy and effort. The School is in a better position at present to accomplish the purpose of its

founders, to fulfil the provisions of its charter, and to meet the demands of the time, than it has ever been before in its history. The outlook is promising.

Urbana University is a part of the community in which it is placed. It owes the community its best effort, and the community owes it due support. In consequence of recent measures, the support of the community is more definite and more fully developed than it has been in the past. This is encouraging; and it imposes a renewed obligation on the part of the School to take a larger share in the welfare of the community. There are obvious ways in which it may make its contribution to the life of the community: it may stimulate and promote interest in higher education; it may direct and guide the religious and social life of the community; it may serve as a center for artistic and literary effort; it may send back highly educated young people into the community to become leaders of thought and conduct.

To accomplish this, Urbana University needs further endowment. When I came here as teacher of Latin and Greek in 1884, I looked around and studied the situation, with the result that I came to the conclusion that the School needed an endowment of at least \$500,000.00 to make a fair start. Under present conditions, it would take \$1,000,000.00 to furnish the equipment needed to make a good beginning of its proper work. At that time we could get men with an A.M. or Ph.D. degree for less than a thousand dollars. Now we must pay two thousand or more. Other costs have gone up proportionally. But the School has always striven to make the most of the means available, and it is making an extraordinary effort to do this at the present time. We have an endowment of about \$500,000.00 now; and besides other improvements, we have a larger faculty, and the largest body of college students we have ever had. We have greater opportunities and greater responsibilities.

Let us consider the next step needed to fulfil our mission. There are two directions of progress that lie immediately before us: one is fuller equipment and better organization; the other is development of educational ideals and theory. As to the first,

we must appeal to this community and to the body of our Church people for adequate endowment, and we must make this appeal both in word and deed. This means that we must keep the community in which we live and our Church people, individually and collectively, informed of our needs, of the work we are doing, and of our purposes and ideals. We must attract the young people, both within and without the Church, and send them out well educated and well equipped for the positions they are to fill, not merely as workmen and wage earners, but as men and women. This is the strongest appeal we can make. Our graduates who go forth imbued with the spirit of the institution, with an appreciation of the advantages it affords, and with zeal for having others share the advantages, will constitute a body of special agents for getting both money and students.

With further endowment and a larger number of students, we must have fuller equipment: buildings, lecture halls, laboratories, gymnasium, constant additions to the library, and larger grounds. But the most important feature of a fuller equipment will be a larger faculty of educated men; and this involves the question of the organization of the instruction, which in view of present educational demands is more than ever a real and pressing question. For the educational needs and demands of the present day are so varied and complicated that educational theory and practice are in great confusion. In spite of the new psychologies, the new philosophies, and the new educational programs, the fundamental principles of education are more seriously in question than ever. We have the denominational college, which places the emphasis upon religious education; we have the liberal arts college, which is struggling to maintain the ideal of the humanities; we have the great state universities and other universities, which comprise academic, graduate, and professional schools; we have highly equipped technical schools, which train experts for the many technical employments; we have institutes, and academies of arts and sciences; we have various experimental schools and colleges, like Antioch and Rollins; we have normal schools; and now we have junior and senior high schools, and junior and senior colleges, not to speak

of the numerous private schools and academies. All these forms of school organization have been developed to meet increasing and changing educational demands—demands incident to the increase of population, which carries with it an immense development of social, industrial, professional, and technical relations. The struggle for existence and for secure position becomes more and more severe and more and more complicated as the population accumulates in enormous industrial and commercial centers. Under these conditions, making a living tends to become the first and too often the only end in view. Accordingly there is insistent pressure upon education to equip the student with immediate wage-earning capacity. This demand leads to all kinds of technical schools and courses, to the comparative neglect of liberal studies. Here then is presented the issue between the liberal and the practical motive and ideal; and the question arises, which ideal is to be preferred and chosen, or how they are to be combined.

This brings us to the problem of the curriculum. Every form of educational theory and educational organization must deal with the ever-increasing multitude of the subjects of instruction, and must attempt to arrange them in an order adapted to the student body. The first question is, what subjects amongst the vast array shall we select. Then we must undertake to arrange these in the order of importance, and as far as possible in the order of logical connection and progress.

Among the psychologies and philosophies now prominent and influential in the field of education, is the theory that emphasizes the connection between thought and action; and this emphasis is so far exaggerated as to make thought a stage or a mode of action. This amounts to identifying thought and conduct. The principle is expressed in the formula, "Teaching by doing." The consistent and rigid application of this principle would convert all schools into playgrounds, workshops, and laboratories. All verbal instruction, lectures, and textbooks elsewhere than on the field of operation, would be done away with. As a protest against too much abstract instruction, this program has value. It also makes effective use of the

important principle, that studies should make use of the natural connection with the familiar knowledge and experience of the pupils.

Here then we have three contrasting ideals: (1) the ideal of the humanities; (2) the technical and practical ideal; and (3) the ideal of "teaching by doing." Upon what basis of principle shall we decide as to the relative importance of these ideals, or how shall we attempt to combine them? There are two principles, two broad fields, which educational system must keep constantly in view: the nature and constitution of human beings; and the body of knowledge from which selection is to be made. The wide range and the exceeding complexity of these two features of the educational environment have kept school organization in a constant movement of expansion and reconstruction. The multiplicity of subjects and the variety of individual taste and capacity have forced the partial abandonment of the compact and symmetrical curriculum of the traditional college, and a partial adoption of an elective system.

In recognition of the endlessly varied endowment of human beings and the enormous multiplicity of the branches of knowledge, Thomas Jefferson in 1825, in establishing the University of Virginia, embodied his ideal of an institution where any man might pursue any important branch of knowledge in the highest degree. This meant that each man would choose the subjects he wished to study; and accordingly the elective system was adopted and put in operation. More recently Harvard College adopted a modified elective system; and under the pressure of circumstances as well as at the demand of theory, other colleges and universities have done the same. In other words, the elective system was one of the important and inevitable results of the pressure of modern conditions and the enlargement of educational theory. But the individual selection of subjects, if allowed free play, would end in educational chaos. As a corrective of this result, the principle of combination and symmetry was introduced in the requirements for degrees. A notable instance of the application of this principle was the M.A. degree of the University of Virginia. This required graduation

in nine schools: English Language and Literature, Greek, Latin, Modern Languages, History, Mathematics, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, and Moral Philosophy. This was the characteristic degree of the institution, and meant the highest degree of general scholarship in these branches. It was a standard curriculum, and had world-wide recognition as a unique achievement in the field of advanced scholarship.

It is in the requirements for degrees that we have a partial solution of the problem of the curriculum; and the necessities of the case, as well as the various attempts to formulate these requirements, show that some form of curriculum is indispensable. Any curriculum must be adapted to the ends and purposes of life, as well as to the multiplicity of tastes, interests, and capacities of individuals, and at the same time to the vast number of subjects to be studied. A glance at the scheme of lectures of any of the large universities shows a bewildering array of courses. Out of these the students and the school authorities must select combinations suited to well-rounded education.

The problem which the curriculum faces is, to discover common characters and elements in students and in subjects which allow simplification and grouping. In spite of individual differences, men do have aims and endowments in common; so the field of knowledge may be reduced to comparatively few principal branches. Men generally have more or less desire for knowledge, and are interested in using the knowledge they acquire. For the most part they aim to be intelligent and moral; they enjoy the beauties of nature and works of art. They must all prepare for useful life, a useful life on various levels. In the field of knowledge, we recognize a few comprehensive groups, such as history, the languages, the sciences, the arts, philosophy, and religion. Some of the knowledge contained in each of these groups enters into the life of every man who grows from childhood into maturity; and as far as possible he should be educated systematically in such knowledge. The curriculum gathers up these common features into a form adapted to the systematic education of the average student, and at the

same time provides for the defective and for the extraordinarily gifted. Any educational scheme must recognize that gifts vary immensely. Some students, perhaps only a few, have little or no capacity for learning mathematics, or the languages, or music, for example; and it would be a waste of time and effort to insist upon giving them advanced instruction in a subject in which they are congenitally deficient. One important function of the school is to try out the capacities of the student, and to put him in the position to select his subjects in accordance with his capacities. But the great body of students come within the two extremes of the defectively constituted and the highly gifted. It is to the average student that the curriculum is especially adapted, and for him it offers an advanced liberal and systematic education.

In accordance with the above principles, the curriculum would take the more definite form of the following list of subjects: 1. History, 2. English, 3. Greek, 4. Latin, 5. Modern Languages, 6. Mathematics, 7. Physics, 8. Chemistry, 9. Biology, 10. Sociology, 11. Psychology, 12. Philosophy, 13. The Arts, and 14. Religion. Obviously this curriculum anticipates further endowment and equipment; with these the range of the several subjects and the number of the subjects would be enlarged. For example, history would be extended to take in archaeology; other languages would be added—first of all Hebrew; physics would be extended to take in mechanics, astronomy, and geology; mathematics would be extended to applied mathematics and symbolic logic; psychology would take in abnormal and subnormal psychology; philosophy would be extended to take in logic, ethics, aesthetics, as well as metaphysics and the history of philosophy; religion would properly take in the history of religion in general and of the Christian religion in particular, as well as the systematic study of the doctrines of the New Jerusalem. Each of these subjects would be taught thoroughly and comprehensively. In connection with each language, the history and science of the language would be taught. So each science would be taught in its historical, logical, and philosophical context. It is plain that this curriculum brings the whole

field of knowledge within the practical range of a compact body of academic instruction, and that it furnishes a standard for an advanced liberal education. This education would be liberal in the sense of freeing the mind from the natural limitations of its environment, geographical and social; it would be advanced in the sense of being carried to the highest stage of present attainment, general but not technical, in the respective branches.

The formation of a curriculum is the crucial test of the theory and practice of education. It involves a definite conception of the ideal which education should aim at; and this involves an adequate knowledge of how to fit men as completely as possible for the positions they are to fill in life. In other words, the formation of a curriculum involves a knowledge of human nature and of the world.

The revelations given through Emanuel Swedenborg extended immensely our knowledge of man and of the universe of which he is a part. Through these revelations we are introduced into hitherto unknown realms: the realm of the objective spiritual world; the realm of an exalted spiritual psychology; and the realm of the philosophy of love. It is the inestimable privilege of New-Church Higher Education to explore these realms, and to make a knowledge of them serviceable to the everyday lives of men. At present, attention is called only to the philosophy which grew out of Swedenborg's experience in the other world; it is this philosophy which gives us the light we need to complete our system of education. The first principle of this philosophy is that God is Love, and conversely, Absolute, Infinite Love is God. It is a standing doctrine of the Christian Church that God is Love; but Christian theology, formulated under the influence of Greek philosophy, has emphasized the doctrine that God is Divine Wisdom. Consequently, the doctrine that God is Love has been thought of as involving a sentimental attitude rather than a principle of religious thought. But when we say that Infinite Love is God, we have a new basis of Christian thought. For we know enough about the nature of love in our common experience to understand that Infinite Love must express itself in the creation of the world, and consequently that Love is the

basis of all creation and all life. The nature of love enables us also to understand two facts of fundamental importance to our religious life, and so to our life as a whole. One is, that God as Love spoke to men in the correspondential language of the Bible; the other is, that as Love He came on earth to save the human race, and did save it by establishing a new center of religious thought and life. The full meaning of these statements cannot, of course, be developed in this brief discussion; but from the nature of the Bible in its spiritual sense it follows that it is a complete record of God's dealing with men from the beginning, that it gives complete knowledge of our spiritual natures and needs, and that it is the unalterable standard of our religious faith.

The spiritual sense of the Bible teaches one supreme fact for the Christian religion; it is that the Lord Jesus Christ glorified is the one only God of heaven and earth, and that Christian worship should be directed to Him alone. It is important to note in passing that in the light of the spiritual meaning of the Bible the theological controversies that have raged over the person of Christ and His place in the Trinity are cleared away. What we want to see at present is, that this spiritual meaning is needed to light up the whole field of education, as well as the whole present life of men. The history of philosophy and the present stage of philosophic thinking show indisputably that naturalism and rationalism have taken almost complete possession of the minds of men in wide and influential circles. The principles of orthodoxy have been to a great extent abandoned; moral standards are questioned and defied; the lessons of the past are ignored. All subjects—religion, social, and personal life, and the rest—are treated according to naturalistic and rationalistic principles and presuppositions. The Bible at the hands of the disciples of the natural history method has been displaced in many quarters as the standard of religious belief, and reduced to the status of a mere tribal record; and to make matters worse, these critics have destroyed its integrity by chopping it up into pieces, and redistributing them; and yet for Christians the Bible is the indispensable basis of religious life.

"If the foundations are destroyed, what shall the righteous do?"

Besides the confusion and disrespect caused by this treatment of the Bible, the far-reaching extension of the natural history method, and the systematic development of the naturalistic and rationalistic presuppositions and prepossessions of this age, have brought about mental and moral conditions widely destructive to spiritual thought and life. We are so constantly enveloped by an atmosphere of naturalism that it requires a deliberate and consistent effort to become aware of its blinding influence. Naturalism starts with the assertion, "Nature is all there is." This shuts out the possibility of the existence of God and of the supernatural, or spiritual, world. For this reason it is the most dangerous foe to spiritual thinking and to religion. Swedenborg was the first to recognize and to develop systematically the essential opposition of naturalism to religion. He defines naturalism as the philosophy which derives all things from nature. This is the evolutionistic formula and the basis of naturalism. This definition is exemplified in the astrophysical theory that all the heavenly bodies originated from exceedingly fine material particles. This is but another form of the atomic theory, which asserts that the universe is atoms in motion. The definition is also exemplified in the biological theory of evolution, which is in brief that all forms of life, man included, come from protoplasm, or protoplasmic cells, chemistry adding that these cells are peculiar combinations of molecules and atoms. So we come back to the formula "the universe is constituted of atoms in motion." The present form of the atomic theory only pushes the origin one step further back, for protons and electrons are very small material particles, or they are mere concepts. This is the philosophy of materialism; and so we see that naturalism, if developed clearly and consistently, reverts to materialism. It is important to see this connection, for naturalism and materialism are constant ingredients in our everyday thinking; and it is necessary to understand this in order to free ourselves for spiritual thinking. This is the highest function of a liberal education.

Urbana University is dedicated to the advancement of spir-

itual life. Our peculiar task is to make use of our body of doctrine for this purpose. Our prime source of enlightenment is the Lord's Word, for this is His chosen means of bringing us into His presence, and under the direct influence of His Holy Spirit of Love and Wisdom. The great lesson of this enlightenment is that our love for the Lord must express itself in our love for our fellow men. Our educational system, therefore, must be used as a means of preparing us to understand and to help the world. But this preparation is a large task. To understand men we must know the history of men,—the history of their thoughts, deeds, and achievements. This must include a knowledge of what they are thinking, doing, and achieving now. What we need is a systematic, not merely a fragmentary knowledge; otherwise our efforts will be misdirected and futile, and we shall be led off by uncomprehended impulses, ideas, and schemes into endless by-paths and vain extremes. Life is exceedingly complex, and clear thinking is a difficult achievement. In spite of our immensely rich historical background, in spite of our unparalleled scientific and mechanical progress, in spite of all the work of our school systems to impart knowledge and train the mind, *the thought of our day is hesitating, doubtful, and chaotic on the great problems of life.* There is lacking the comprehensive grasp of history and science to bring unity into our thought and lives. What is needed is a unifying principle, a central point of view, which will bring order into our lives and into the world around us, and which will enable us to view the universe as a systematic whole. The history of philosophy shows many attempts to discover and make use of such a principle. The most successful was the philosophy of Idealism, which made thought the unifying principle. This was a great step towards unification, but it has never been able to overcome the obstacle presented by the existence of material bodies. The Christian doctrine of creation made the outer universe the product of spirit, and so spiritualized the world of matter. But this doctrine has never advanced to the stage of a consistent theory.

Swedenborg's philosophy found its unifying principle in the

nature of love. Love is obviously a conjunctive force, but it is also demonstrably the basic fact in the universe. If we follow it out in the family circle, in social relations, in industrial and political life, and especially in intellectual, moral, and spiritual life, not to speak of the biological and physical realms, we see that it is the one force that brings things together, and keeps them moving in the chosen direction. Swedenborg's whole system of philosophy is built on a spiritual view and understanding of the universe. His doctrine of love transforms our view of the world and of life, and places love in the spiritual center of things. In this doctrine, the difference between unselfish and selfish love is for the first time clearly defined and systematically developed. Plato saw that love is the love of some object, and in his view its highest form is the love of beauty. Swedenborg defines the essence of love as the love of others. The fundamental statement in his doctrine of creation is, that the Divine Love and Wisdom do not exist otherwise than in others created to be the object of the Love and Wisdom. The first clear and complete definition of the difference between unselfish and selfish love is given as follows: to feel another's joy as joy in one's self is to love; but to feel one's own joy in another is not to love the other, but to love one's self. By this test we can determine whether our love is true or not. Self-love is the source of all evil. The love of others is universal in its sweep. Each individual is a center from which this love extends first to the family circle, then to the community of friends and neighbors, to the city, the state, the nation, and to all mankind; it has this character because it is the Lord's love for him and through him that gives it this character. *Love is the supreme unifying principle.* Education is at its best when it develops the nature of love in thought and deed, in the appreciation of beauty, and in the service of men.

With the equipment sufficient to carry out at its highest level the curriculum we have considered, and under the guidance of the principles of the philosophy we have sketched, Urbana University would be in a position to make its distinctive contribution to the work of education both within the Church and

outside it. From many points of view and with various meanings this is called the New Age. Time is wanting to specify and consider the expressions in which this idea takes form. If we look closely at the significance of these expressions, we find little that is clear and definite; they seem to be for the most part aspirations and suggestions, rather than views and convictions based upon positive knowledge.

There is one body of knowledge and religious belief which, though inconspicuous in the world at large, is nevertheless quietly influential in thoughtful circles, and big with measureless possibilities. It is based definitely on the revelations of Emanuel Swedenborg. These revelations cover an immense field of fact and doctrine; they give knowledge of many kinds and degrees. One item of great practical and religious importance is the distinction between the natural and the spiritual. The easiest and most obvious way of making the distinction is, to observe the difference between our thoughts and feelings as concerned with the objects of the outer world and the outward aspects of our conduct, and our states of mind as to religious quality; that is, our states of mind as consciously related to the Lord and the life we receive from Him. For it is the conscious reception of life from the Lord that gives specific religious and spiritual character. In other words, we receive the Lord's life of Love and Wisdom in our thoughts and feelings about the Lord. If we had no knowledge of the Lord, He could not give us His Love and Wisdom in the higher conscious forms, but only in our thoughts and feelings about other things, such as food, clothing, and other natural activities. This is why religion is so important and necessary, and why the Lord has provided that men of all races and of all times should have religion of some kind or other. When we consider the contents of the Bible both in its literal and in its spiritual meaning, we see what an immense body of positive knowledge we have of the Lord and of His ways to men. It is this knowledge which it is most of all important to teach young and old. Knowledge of the world and of men is important and necessary, but knowledge

of the Lord and of His dealings with men is of supreme importance.

The education which Urbana University aims to give, and tries to give to the limit of its equipment, is this higher level of knowledge of the Lord and of men. It performs its first duty to the public when it does its best to give out this knowledge, and the public gives its best support to enable it to teach this knowledge at its highest and best, with understanding, and with application to the life of the world.

LEWIS F. HITE.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

DULY HUMBLE.

"Neither shalt thou go up by steps upon mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon." (*Exodus* 20:26.)

Perhaps this is one of those passages in the Bible which modern scholarship would label obsolete. Perhaps the average reader, wanting to believe still the plenary inspiration of the Word, may even wonder what application this command can have for him today. Certainly they must be few who can believe that it should be taken as applicable to the altars and worshippers in our own houses of worship.

Nevertheless it does have a message for us today. It is not obsolete; nor will it ever be; neither will any other words be that ever were given to man at the dictate of God. It has a command for us, as truly as it had to those to whom it first was pronounced. But there is this difference: it was the letter of that command that was of significance to Israel; but it is the spirit of it that is for us. Lift it from the region of the local and the particular, up to where at the core it belongs, up into the region of the universal from which its urge first came, lift it up so, and it will yield its command to man of the Twentieth Century; and it will, still, to men of the One Hundredth Century.

Look backward over a page or two of this holy record, and fix the setting for these words.

The setting was made for the promulgation of the great Ten Words,—as the Hebrew calls them; we call them the Ten Commandments. It was not that they were new in the world, for men knew previously the plain decencies of life which they express. But what was new was, and what was important beyond every other consideration imaginable was, that these

should be known not only as laws of men, but as *The Laws of GOD*; thus that they were outward expressions of the summary of the laws governing and operating the spiritual universe. The setting was made for the miraculous declaration from God Himself of these laws. The people were prepared. Everything was done to impress the intense holiness of it all. GOD was to come down from the infinite distances and be before them upon that mountain, and speak His laws to them from that mountain. GOD was to come,—their Creator, their Deliverer, their Keeper, their Safety now, and their only Hope for the future: Jehovah Elohim, the very I AM the I AM was coming before them, upon that mountain. But they were very natural-minded people, and very crude in their spiritual sensitivities. It was to fear that they were sensitive, rather than to reverence from the pure awe of devotion and adoration: fear for their own lives was their chiefest thought when contemplating the immeasurable difference in degree between themselves and God. "No man could look upon God and live,"—that was the beginning and the end of their conception of it. And they wanted to live.

Therefore the setting which was Divinely directed to teach due humility on the one hand, and due reverence of worship on the other, was effective with those material-minded, body-bound people, but little beyond the fear-awakening degree.

But the greater message was there in that setting for the few who could take it then; and it is there still for all who in future ages can take it, and be profited by it in their souls.

And for us! Is it fear that moves us as we cover again that ground, in *The Book*, and review that scene? Is it fear, or is it an intellectual and emotional stirring before the represented distances in substance, character, and essential being, between ourselves and God? And then, seeing these, feeling these, what of the thoughts of appreciation, of wonderment, and of self-subduing and paradoxical joy-lifting contemplation, that merge into worship? What of the emotions flowing from these thoughts, out of the marvel of the fact that in spite of all these distances of difference between us, *He* has made a way to bridge

the chasms, has clothed Himself in words, has enfolded Himself in settings and scenes and events, in such carefulness and exactness that by these means He may be able,—when these words and these investing and enveloping representations are unwrapped,—that He may be able thus marvellously to stand forth revealed before our pigmy, mortal, finite minds? How do we feel in contemplation of these things, which the very act of thinking upon is alone a wonder, a gift, and at once a ground for praise and thanksgiving,—and for humiliation, and confession and consecration, and worship?

Do we feel, as some men try these days to teach us we ought to feel, that after all there is not much difference between us and Him but size, and that size itself is only of relative importance? Are we made bold to stand high on tiptoe with self-assertion, claiming for ourselves rights as substantial parts of Himself, boasting our divinity?

If this is our tendency, then let us read again the instructions to Israel which representatively show all men their proper place with respect to the Infinite Father and Lord of all. To Moses, the representative of the Law itself, it was commanded: "Set bounds unto the people round about [the mount], that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death: there shall not a hand touch it." Again: "Go down, charge the people lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish." And once more: "Let not the priests and the people break through to come up unto the Lord, lest He break forth upon them." Lest the blazing Light blind them; lest the glowing ardor of that pure Love consume them!

If these are not warnings enough against men's exalting themselves into irresponsible familiarity with the Divine,—becoming like the self-righteous scribes and Pharisees who felt no need of the Great Physician,—then the awe-filling accompaniments to the actual giving of the Commandments upon the Mount of Sinai ought to be read again with open-minded will to see their real significance.

Then pass on over the actual Ten Words themselves. As soon

as they have been put forth,—the summary of all spiritual laws presented, revealed, stamped with God's own authority, presented in His own order and sequence,—as soon as God's own mind has thus been unfolded, His order appointed for human life made plain, then He returns to the proper attitude of man toward God,—not, mind you, for any pleasure that it may give Him to be revered, but for the sake of the proper effect on man's soul that his attitude toward his Creator must have. "Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven." He recalls to them. "Ye shall not make with Me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold." This is to say, when the symbol garment is unrolled, "Ye shall not put on a level with Myself and My Revelation just given to you, the fashionings of your own thoughts and your own hearts. I have revealed to you what is true, and what is good. Do not yourselves presume, or dare, to exalt your own ideas and your own ideals to the level of these that I reveal; for they are of a different substance, and a different nature: they cannot both survive together; and your own, once lifted, will soon supplant Mine Own. No man can serve two masters."

But what you shall do is this: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: (and) in all places where I record My Name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." This is the true order. The altar signifies, of course, worship; for worship is the end for which an altar exists. It is to be built of earth, because earth (literally ground), being soft as contrasted with stones mentioned next, represents those things which are of the heart and the affections in the whole complex. On the basis of these, the special and particular affections of the life are to be brought to the Lord, and yielded up to Him: the burnt-offerings, and the peace-offerings, the sheep, and the oxen. This is the true foundation for worship—the whole groundwork of the heart itself.

But if you have to begin with the head, in your approach toward worship; if you have to come to the Lord by the avenue of the mind first—as, indeed, the Israelites always did,

and as we all do today—then take your thoughts from *Me*, out of My Revelation to you, and never from yourself. Thus it is said: "And if thou wilt make Me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it."

Could any thing be plainer than this, or stronger in warning against the spiritual deadliness of our human self-intelligence? The altar of stones is worship built on truths, the altar built in the mind instead of in the heart primarily. The stones man finds, ready-given; even as so he finds truths of God's revelation, ready-given. To the Israelite it meant those physical stones only, and simply; it was a formality, a ceremony. But to us it is the truths of revelation, of God's Word, ready-given. They are pure; their form is heaven-sent and heaven-moulded. We are to take them as such, own and know that they are such; and not begin to use the tools of the Age's sophisticated self-intelligence, to trim these down and fashion them over to a pattern more pleasing to the dictates of our un-reborn hearts. To think to improve upon the Word,—to delete portions of it that we do not like the sound of or that we think not quite modern,—to try to "improve" it by translating it into free and even flippant English,—to presume that it often does not say what it meant to say,—or that, if, for example, the Lord had had the modern knowledge of psychology in possession, He would not have said some of the things which He, being ignorant of these advanced knowledges, did say,—to do these things is to lift up our poor, shrivelled, twisted, nicked, and pigmy finite tools of intellection upon the noble stones of truth as it has come from the Mind and dictum of the very Infinite One Himself. O man, O man! Find thyself, hide thyself! Hide thyself a while with shame,—until thou see the *Truth*, and know in truth thy real standing, when thou facest God, and triest to remould to thy pleasure His revelation of His Law for thee. "For if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it!"

And listen, one word further! After you have made the altar, in your heart, or in your mind, after you have lifted up a place of worship within your soul, be careful how you ap-

proach to it. For if it is a place of real worship, worship really of the Lord, then the Lord is there as in a sanctuary. Be careful of your attitude toward it; remember that always there is "holy ground"; that that altar is something in itself immeasurably above "you." The stones you have built it of are the Lord's own truths. And what you offer thereon are affections that by the Lord's own urge and drawing power, by your consent, are lifted and raised up there, to that plane so far above you,—the you of yourself alone. Be careful always to keep "yourself" out of it, and not mix your *self* up in it. Do not ever let yourself into any idea that you are beginning to be yourself lifted up to the level of the Lord, and so identified with Him in self-satisfactions. Beware of this. Its temptation is very subtle. Its victims are beyond number. This is the way He warns us: "Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto [literally in the Hebrew, "upon"] Mine altar: that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon." For "He that exalteth himself shall be abased." Do not lift yourself up too close to the ambition to equality with your Lord; for the higher you get into that all-perfect, all-revealing light, the more vividly will your inadequacies and imperfections and corruptions be made manifest. Do not claim a place above where the Lord Himself shall choose for you. Do not go "up by steps"—by your own self-placing, self-ascending, self-appreciating feelings upon His altar. Rather let Him do the placing on these higher levels as He sees your preparation and your readiness to go.

The clothing of the mind is of truths woven into thoughts which the mind, with greater or less habituality, wraps about itself. And nakedness is the absence of truths for such clothing.

Therefore, take heed, O presumptive, pigmy mind of man, that you shall not mistake the garments of the thoughts you weave in self, for the robes of royalty and Deity which are of God alone, revealed in wholeness in the Word that He, not man, has spoken. Have no altar in your mind that is not of *whole* stones!

EVERETT K. BRAY.

THE PRE-NATAL AND THE POST-NATAL IN THE
SPIRITUAL REALM OF BEING.

It is ordained by the Divine that man at the very outset of his physical existence should live a life that is peculiarly and profoundly different from his later life, from which it is separated by the radical event called birth. It is in line with the fact that life in general as it proceeds from the Divine as its source in its initial stages is wrapped in much mystery and obscurity. And the creature who is the recipient of life has already passed through its initial stages before he himself becomes conscious of it.

It is very interesting to study the particulars of this pre-natal life. Such study becomes still more interesting when we come to consider that this pre-natal life as a development of a physical body mirrors forth to us the initial stages of the development of man as a spiritual being. The student of the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg will be familiar with the idea. By means of the physical pre-natal life as a type or symbol we may become acquainted with any particular pertaining to the initial stages of the development of man's spiritual life. That it may be very important and useful for man to have this latter knowledge will appear as this article progresses. The ideas advanced are quite original as far as the writer is concerned. His limited reading fails him to bring to his recollection any setting forth by other persons of this analogy between the earliest stages of man's physical and man's spiritual life. As a result he holds himself open for correction and criticism.

We are familiar with the thought that the physical world furnishes types or symbols for things belonging to the spiritual realm of being. Do pre-natal life, birth, and post-natal life serve as types in this way as well? There is a standard passage in Swedenborg confirmatory of this matter. As to birth, we all are very familiar with its being employed as a type for the beginning of things. The Sacred Scriptures speak of birth other than a physical one,—a birth that is of water and of the spirit. And when we use the birth as a symbol in telling about

the very beginning of things, does it ever occur to us that back of such figurative birth there is still an earlier life, as we know there is previous to a physical birth?

Often something like this does cross our minds when we come to think of the things that went before in preparation of the event. Thus we speak of the birth of the Reformation as happening when Martin Luther nailed his ninety-five theses upon the door of the castle Church at Wittenberg, realizing that much went before to make this event possible. Similarly with a nation which is said to be born when it assumes an independent existence under its own constitution and laws, and the rule of its own governing head: much went before that led to this event. And when we talk about the spiritual birth which according to the Sacred Scriptures each human being must experience for his own self would he ever enter heaven, do we ever think that back of this birth there might be a pre-natal life? Birth,—of what? From what? Intuitively we perceive that there can be no birth without something to be born from. What is that something?

There is the philosophy of play. People of a philosophic mind have been wondering why children play. Now it seems to me that the age of play is pre-eminently a pre-natal life, speaking in the figurative sense. A child is impelled to play, giving no heed at all to the question of why it should play. It does not dwell upon the question, What is the use of play? It simply plays. But as it plays it develops its body wonderfully, and trains its members in the performance of their functions. Later in life the child will become conscious of its own self, beginning to reflect on the powers of his being. And aided by the spirit of religion it will make these powers of use to his fellowmen. But while the idea of usefulness was absent with the child when it was playing, still the Lord who was preparing through play the child for an active and conscious life of use, was fully intent upon use. In this the Lord then stood alone. He had a definite purpose in view while the child had not. But after the child himself had learned through reflection his powers for good, and had consecrated them to a life of

usefulness, then there was effected a co-operation between the child and the Lord. Then both had the same purpose. Then there were two at work. Can we not see that there is some aspect to the playing child that is analogous to the pre-natal life?

And so, as a general thing, the pre-natal life in the spiritual realm of being is a life that is devoid of purpose; the post-natal is a life with purpose. And while a life devoid of purpose is to be condemned, yet we may see that it is possible that a period of that kind of life may be a part of a man's normal life conformable to Divine standards. But the purposeless drifting on the part of the child as far as its own initiative goes must cease; it must begin to live from a definite purpose, using the powers it finds itself endowed with in the service of his fellowmen. It "must be born again."

The same matter may be stated in other words. We can say that in each man's life there is a period in which the Lord cares for that man, and leads that man without that man being aware of it. Especially can this be said of the man in his childhood. The Lord thus cares for an infant and a child; He thus cares for any unregenerate person. This is a pre-natal state of life on the part of such human beings. The sensing by them of this care exercised by the Lord constitutes man's spiritual birth; and his conscious cooperation with the Lord for his further spiritual development constitutes his post-natal life. We shall love the Lord because that He loved us first (I John 4:19). This treatment of the matter would cover the orthodox, the evangelical view of a man's conversion to Christianity.

There is a phenomenon in nature that in its process is remarkably analogous to the process of man's development as a physical being in regard to his birth and the periods preceding and following. It is the manner in which the light of the sun comes to us every morning under normal circumstances. It is here treated of because it sheds additional light of much importance upon the problem under discussion. There is the dawn, the sunrise, and the period following sunrise. In this order these three things respectively are analogous to the pre-

natal life, birth, and the post-natal life. The dawn gives a light that is diffused; it is a light that, to be true, has its source in the sun; but it is able to reach us by being reflected in its way by earthly substances. Sunrise is not so much a bursting forth of light in its full splendor, since with the rising of the sun there is hardly a distinguishable increase of light over what there was a minute before; but it comes especially as a revelation of the source of the light that has come so far. With the sunrise there comes a radiated light; it is a light that can be traced to its source, and is directly connected with that source. And after sunrise we will have both kinds of light, the light that is reflected through earthly substances, and the light that comes direct from the sun.

Let us now translate all this coming of earthly light into its corresponding spiritual verities. Light thus becomes translated into truth; the sun as the ultimate source of light, into the Lord from Whom all truth comes. The earthly substances that reflect light become all the human agencies who receiving truth in a direct way from the Lord, transmit it to others who as yet are in no direct communication with the Lord. Sunrise becomes translated into the revelation of the Lord as the source of all truth; and the period following sunrise comes to signify man's life when truth comes to him in two ways: one direct from the Lord Himself; and another indirect through instruction from fellowmen. We instinctively perceive that the light of truth that comes to the child and, in general, to any unregenerate person, is a diffused light; it is a light that is not centered in anything; it is not a radiated light. And it is very interesting to observe that, in the account of the Creation as found in the first chapter of Genesis, light as a diffused something is manifested first, to be followed later by the creation of sun, moon, and stars as the centers from which light radiates. And it appears to me as if in the New Testament there is also a shadowing forth of the same matter in the persons of a John the Baptist and the Lord Himself; the one preceding, and the other following. And do we not feel the necessity of the light thus gradually coming to man first through the agencies of

others? Suppose that the sun in all its splendor should all at once appear out of the black darkness of the night! To what spasms of enthusiasm would not a man commit himself, if spiritual light in all its glory and abundance should come to him who a moment before sat in total darkness? Let our imagination answer this question. No; evidently, something, somebody is sent before the coming of the Lord in glory in preparation for such coming.

There is still another story to be found in the Sacred Scriptures, that should not be passed by, as illuminating all that has been said. This is the story of Mary and her giving birth to the Christ-Child. Should it surprise us that this story can be made to bear upon our subject? Is it not from Mary that the Christ came forth and entered the world; the Christ Who called Himself the Light of the World? The Mary that is "with child" is the man who not only holds a measure of truth within himself, but who as well identifies that measure of truth with himself. He will say—if he has the maturity of life that our modernists have—that he is wise from himself, and that he has a spark of the Divine within himself. But the Mary who has given birth to the Christ-Child is the one who has learned to consider the measure of truth that he has as an entity by itself. And this measure of truth as an entity by itself, separate from his own being, he has to nurse in order that it may live and grow. Ultimately this growing measure of truth is destined to govern his life; yea, destined to function as the great fountain of his life, and thereby become his Father from which to derive all his life. By thus exalting that measure of truth to Divine Fatherhood, he will realize the Peace that is promised to them who observe the Lord's Commandments. (Isaiah 9:6.) Very appropriately this measure of truth is called "Immanuel," that is, "God with us." It is not only to the historic Virgin Mary that a child was to be born. The sacred record reads: "Unto *us* a child is born; unto *us* a son is given." We may readily recognize in the Mary that is "with Child" the pre-natal period of a man's spiritual life; in the birth of the Christ-Child, man's spiritual birth; and in the period following, the post-natal life,

when we are called upon to nurture our spiritual life actively and consciously.

And can we not see that this story of Mary and her Child figures forth to us things that we might observe these latter days? Are there not millions and again millions who are a Mary "with child"; who exalt themselves for possessing truth instead of adoring and exalting the Divine Christ? All those who consider that they possess Divinity just as it is said that the Christ is Divine, belong to this class. In justice to them let it be said that all of us must pass through that state of life first before the proper relations between the Christ and ourselves can be established. There can be no real spiritual birth without such a pre-natal period preceding. And we who are of the New Church may also observe something else for our enlightenment and consolation. We often hear among ourselves talk concerning the immense internal growth of the New Church that is going on in the world at large. Even people outside of our fold have been heard to testify concerning that fact. And we are now prepared to see that there must first be internal growth before there can be external growth. And the one is the great promise of the other. But let us not imagine that this internal growth is the ultimate verity of the New Church. The pre-natal life should, through birth, become post-natal. The millions who have a measure of New-Church truth without ever having known anything about Swedenborg and the books that he wrote, or who do not trace those truths to Swedenborg as their source,—the millions who have the light of dawn, but not the direct light of the sun,—should come to recognize the great source of all that new light that is now flooding the world. The Lord cannot rest until this has come to pass. Here also it can be said: "Ye must be born again."

And how little is the idea of "mother" brought in when, as for example in our orthodox churches, the spiritual birth is spoken of! Who, or what is it that functions as a mother? In general it is the immediate environment from which we imbibe in our pre-natal state our religious ideas, ideals, and life, that is the mother. That environment is not necessarily

confined to a single personality. As to the New Church, it might be properly said that the external institution itself of this church, which is responsible for all the broadcasting of its truth over the world through the use of the printing press and that of its ordained ministry, should be regarded as the mother. And if the infant is instinctively drawn toward its mother for all that life means to it because that that mother first nourished and protected it in her womb, knowing or rather feeling that that mother can be depended upon for the further preservation and nurturing of its life, shall it not be natural for such as consider themselves born into the New Church to be drawn to the external organization of that Church, and live in close communion with it, holding themselves receptive towards its ministrations? Can we have such an independence of mind as considering that we can get along without that mother? It is true that we gained a certain measure of independence already through the mere birth. Already we draw the same air in our lungs as the mother does; and in other ways we draw our life from the very sources from which also the mother draws hers, instead of drawing them unconsciously exclusively from the mother alone, as it was before our birth. The fact that the physical infant still depends for its life upon certain fundamental things that only a mother can give, should arrest our attention sufficiently as to honor the New Church as an external organization. The Divine Commandment to honor our mother finds here a profound application. In this it is eminently true that a new state of life contains much of what existed already in the old preceding state, being carried into it from this old state. It is a good example of the poetry that might be found in life. For is it not a fundamental characteristic of poetry that something of what was contained in preceding lines or words is to be found also in succeeding ones? Is not this the real meaning of rhyme, alliteration, and rhythm? Does not this define also the poetry that is to be found in the Hebrew Psalms, or in such poems as Longfellow's "*Hiawatha*"?

What is the practical aspect of the whole matter? What is the use of knowing all this? First of all, we may observe things

concerning the Divine government. Where before we had cause for complaint and adverse criticism, we may now have cause for rejoicing and tranquil patience. The imperfections we beheld in this world have now become promises of perfections that the future holds in store for us. Moreover if we would work for the Lord,—or rather *with* the Lord,—we find the way made plainer. Instead of seeking to accomplish our ends at once, we realize that it is a way we have to tread, would we ever reach those ends. Especially is the subject enlightening to a would-be missionary. He will have to reckon with a pre-natal life, would he ever lead people to their spiritual birth. The Sacred Scriptures in the opening verses of the Gospel of John appear to teach that spiritual conception is effected already with every man that is born into the world. "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." (John 1:9.) It is as the Lord Himself said: "I am not sent, but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; and as he instructed his disciples accordingly as well. These lost sheep of the house of Israel are elements of good and truth that are present within men without being definitely related by them to the Heavenly Father from whom they originally came, as it pertains to them before their spiritual birth is effected. It is the duty of the missionary to search for these elements in mankind in order that he may restore the connection between them and the Heavenly Father. What is found to be diffuse must become radiated. The source of life must be presented to the people that as yet live without the living God and these people must learn to recognize this only source of life that henceforth they may consciously apply themselves to that source for further sustenance and growth. The orthodox may ask: What about that good that is to be found in the heathen? Must we not rather teach the heathen that they are altogether sinful and subject to condemnation, if they do not repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as their only Savior? That good that is to be found in the heathen has been of an invisible and internal growth, coming to them through invisible channels, and appropriated by them rather unconsciously. It truly came from the

Father of all, but like a Mary "with Child" they identified it with themselves. The missionary thus comes to them as one that reapeth where another has already sown.

Still, even with the coming of the missionary, all the necessary pre-natal growth may not have been effected, and much may have to be done yet, before birth can be realized. In this connection it is to be said that in these latter days it instinctively has been recognized by some that there is a necessity under such circumstances of coming to people in a quiet and unheralded way, and of having people imbibe unconsciously the truth and good of life that they have to offer to them. As a result we now have medical, and even industrial, missionaries. It would seem as if the ordinary layman who attends only to his natural duties, and in no way tries to make propaganda in behalf of his religion, would make the ideal instrument for the promotion and nurture of the pre-natal life in his fellowmen. And is it not true that while parents find it extremely hard to train their children in the ways desired by them, it is just those things in the actual life of the parents as never come to the surface for conscious observation and discussion, let alone disputations, that readily but unconsciously are assimilated by the children and made a part of their own life? And I often have thought that it is rather providential that the great bulk of our so-called "isolated receivers" in the New Church are just simple ordinary folks, finding very small time, or even inclination, to further the cause of their Church in their several communities; because the conditions of life that exist with them are extremely favorable to the pre-natal growth which brooks no artificial forcing or interference.

The subject looms up large. There is much yet to be said, even such as is fundamental and very interesting. There is the idea that in all our human leading, the Lord is the One great and only Leader Who selects from what comes from human hands the things that are really needed in the developing of the human organism both before and after birth; just as from what we eat and drink there is selected what might serve for the keep and upbuilding of our physical bodies. And as we grow wiser

and more mature, it will be our problem to eliminate in our work performed as missionaries all the waste and needless things that the Lord must ignore as not serving His purpose. For, after all, we must learn to conform our ways to the ways as the Lord is doing things. Secondly, the subject of the spiritual birth as an event happening at the "psychological moment" invites further study and treatment. Thirdly, I might point out how in our orthodox circles much in the effort of reclaiming human souls is put forward that really belongs to the post-natal period and not to the pre-natal period where the application now generally is made. Fourthly, it might be shown how various movements to be observed these days and held to be antagonistic to each other, may be seen to be but parts of one whole, one succeeding and perfecting the other. Fifthly, it might have been said that the acquisition of knowledge from the mere love of knowing constitutes a pre-natal period to which the acquisition of knowledge for the sake of applying it in definite ways in fields of use serves as the post-natal period.

But I must forego. As I had closed this article I noticed in *The Leader*, a weekly religious periodical published in the Dutch Reformed Church, an editorial which in a startling way re-enforces the views set forth by the present writer. I here quote in part:

Is this [the matter of "common grace"] a matter that Dutchmen get excited over? Even if that were the case, it would not prove the matter is insignificant. Dutch church history has touched practically every important problem of religion and life, and in addition has touched and solved many of the problems that American Church life is just getting excited over. That this matter of common grace is more than a foolish Dutch quibble is clear from such a quotation as the following:

"The inmates of jails and penitentiaries constitute, no doubt, unpromising material. But it is a great mistake, it is said, to tell them they are bad, to discourage them by insisting on their sin. On the contrary, we are told, what ought to be done is to find the good that is already in them, and build upon that; we ought to appeal to some latent sense of honor which shows that even criminals possess the remnants of our common human nature. Thus again the evil that is in man is to be overcome not by a foreign good but by a good which man himself possesses.

"Certainly there is a large element of truth in the modern principle. That element of truth is found in the Bible. The Bible does certainly teach that the good that is already in man ought to be fostered to check the evil. Whatsoever things are true and pure and of good report—we ought to think on these things. Certainly the principle of overcoming the world's evil by the good already in the world is a great principle. The old theologians recognized it to the full in their doctrine of "common grace." There is something in the world, even apart from Christianity which restrains the worst manifestations of evil. And that something ought to be used. Without the use of it the world could not be lived in for a day. The use of it is certainly a great principle; it will certainly accomplish many useful things.

"But—it will not remove sin; what is really needed is a new life given by the Holy Spirit in 'regeneration' or the new birth." (Machen, "Christianity and Liberalism." P. 137, ff.)

Prof. Machen thus makes clear that this is not merely a "miserable Dutch quibble," and also shows that it is a very practical principle in the Christian's relation to the conversion of criminals, as well as in many another social and religious question.

In the *NEW-CHURCH REVIEW* of October, 1923, there was an article by Mr. Edmond Congar Brown entitled "The Affectional Appeal in Missionary Work." The present article views the matter of missionary work from an altogether different angle. Both articles advance factors that are necessary for realizing success. The things that have been said by the present writer have evolved themselves gradually to his consciousness over a period of many years,—about a quarter of a century, I should judge; they all supplementing and strengthening each other. He had the good fortune of realizing the new birth in his own life; and from this fact as a living experience he has drawn—and is still drawing—much that has enlightened him. The affirmative attitude towards the existence of a spiritual sense within the literal sense of the Word of God also has helped him to arrive at certain of the ideas. He hopes that the New Church at large will receive what has been advanced by him here kindly.

JACOB POSTMA.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"THE PRESENT CRISIS IN RELIGION"*

THE present condition of the religious world is one of unparalleled distress and confusion. The drift away from religion is obvious and world-wide. Within the various religious groups there is more or less indifference, doubt, and dissension. These conditions are exaggerated in the western world; but the East has caught the infection of the West, and the religious defection and unrest are universal. In the Christian world, especially in Protestantism,—not so much apparently in Catholicism,—the drift from the churches, and the revolt against the claims and the obligations of religion, are most serious and threatening. Christian thought is disintegrating, and Christian morals are repudiated and abandoned in principle, if not in practice. Young and old are beginning to use familiarly and habitually the language of a radical naturalism and individualism, and are giving themselves to blind and reckless experimentation in personal, social, and political life. It is no easy matter to make an accurate survey of the whole complicated and disordered situation, but any and every one can observe some at least of the ever-present features.

The book before us—Dr. W. E. Orchard's "The Present Crisis in Religion"—presents an admirable survey and discussion of the religious crisis through which we are passing. The facts of the situation are squarely faced and fairly dealt with. Both the favorable and the unfavorable aspects are discussed and estimated. The author is well informed and well trained. He thinks and writes clearly, with firm conviction, but with

* *The Present Crisis in Religion*. By THE REV. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. (London). New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1929. 281 pp., 8vo. Price \$2.50.

sympathetic appreciation of the many various and conflicting interests involved. He attempts first to present the situation as it is, which exhibits the crisis; and he undertakes a forecast of the ultimate triumph of the Christian religion.

A glance at the headings of the chapters assures us of the seriousness and the thoroughness of the treatment. First we have a survey of "The Present Condition of Religion." This is followed by a searching investigation into "The Causes of the Present Crisis." Through this we are prepared to appreciate "The Issues Critical for Humanity." The issues are truly critical, and they are forcibly presented. But however serious and threatening the actual situation, we have grounds for hope in "The Prospects of Recovery." The recovery involves "The Rehabilitation of the Church." The closing chapter discusses the conditions for "The Revival of Religion."

The book is reverent in tone, broad in spirit and interests, and firmly loyal to the Christian faith. An adequate bibliography, though much needed, is wanting; but the frequent references in foot-notes to recent books shows that the author is abreast with the thought of the age; he is comfortably at home in his field. The arrangement and organization of the material should make a strong and positive impression upon the reader that the case for religion and for Christianity, though the situation is serious and even alarming, is by no means desperate, provided fundamental principles are grasped and applied.

What then is the actual present state of religion? The author's conclusion, based upon close observation and study, is that religion is at an unparalleled crisis, that its status is more than ever precarious, that it is obviously and widely decadent, and that it is being steadily abandoned by the great body of the people. It may be said with truth that, as history shows, religion has passed through many crises. In each case revival movements have sprung up, and given the declining religion new impulse and life; for example, the Evangelical Revival. But in these cases there were strong forces at work through strong individuals to stem the tide of decay and dissolution. At present, no such forces and individuals are visibly or generally

at work. The fact that past crises have been met is therefore no assurance as to the present crisis. History shows that religion has always had a precarious hold on mankind, and that its decline and defeat have ever been warded off by extraordinary and well directed effort.

The evidence that religion is decadent and being abandoned is given in the falling off of church attendance, and especially the falling off of Sunday school attendance. There are considerable numbers who welcome the desertion of the Churches as evidence that they no longer meet the needs of the people. They say that there is more religion outside the Churches than inside. This raises the question as to the meaning of religion; but it is safe to say that a religion that does not express itself in common worship and in private devotion lacks the full nature of religion. If religion be stripped of externalities and forms, and of definite ideas and principles, it may remain for a while as vague sentiment and as an attitude towards the universe or "reality," but it will be eventually submerged in the interests of practical and worldly life. There is no evidence that family worship and private devotion are kept up more outside than inside the Churches. Opposition to the Churches, to the Church in any form, may be grounded in rationalism, in naturalism, or in political and social animosity; or it may be grounded in dissatisfaction with its doctrines or with its forms and practices, with "ecclesiasticism" as such; but in any case the Church cannot be dissociated from the community of men, from the life of religion. It follows that the falling off of Church attendance is coincident with the abandonment of religion; and that the extinction of the Church in any and every form would involve the extinction of religion.

The causes of this condition are not far to seek. The pre-occupations of business and out-door life, the passion for amusement and sense gratification, absorb our energies and interests. Our automobiles take us into the country rather than to church; the theatre and the movies supply us with emotional excitement; the story writers in periodicals and novels appeal to social interests and to the imagination; the radio

enables us to sit quietly at home and enjoy music and oratory; and the telephone makes neighborly gossip easy. These modern conditions divert the mind from serious religious reflection, and make religion seem remote from ordinary human life. Neither religion nor the Church seem to have every-day importance. The consequence is that religion is neglected and the churches are deserted. But deeper than these circumstances, there are intellectual and personal forces that are directed to the destruction of the Church and religion.

The author analyzes these conditions, and sums up the causes with impressive clearness and force. First of all, the rationalism and naturalism of the age have exploited scientific knowledge and method in an attack upon the foundations of religion and especially of Christianity. The idea of God has been made to appear as a mere creation of man's imagination, and the existence of God has been excluded by the nature of the universe such as science has discovered this to be. The theory of evolution accounts for the existence of the heavenly bodies and for the course of biological history. Life and consciousness are but important episodes of this history. The Evangelical Revival was able to resist the rationalistic attack of the eighteenth century by appeal to the Bible which was then accepted by the mass of the people as the Word of God and as the standard of Christian faith. The attacks upon Genesis were countered by the principle of symbolic meaning. But in our day the attacks of the Higher Critics have been aimed at the very structure of the Bible, and as a result the whole Christian view of the Bible has been thrown into confusion and displaced. Instead of being the revealed Word of God, the Bible has been accepted to an ominous extent by pulpit and pew as mere tribal history with some perhaps peculiar religious value. Destructive criticism did not stop with the Old Testament; the New Testament was also submitted to "historical analysis," and its character as a veritable account of the Lord's life was brought in question at almost every point, so that the ordinary reader was made to feel that it is entirely untrustworthy. An even more destructive phase of the attack on the Lord's Divinity was added when the New

Psychology, after the historical critic had explained the Gospel story and the Lord's position in it as the product of myth making, undertook to show on the basis of the contents of the story that Jesus was a neuropathic subject. Thus for numberless people who have accepted the results of one or another of the Higher Critics, the whole Scripture basis of Christianity has been destroyed. The whole Christian view of history has been discredited. The Christian plan of salvation has been rejected, and with it the whole body of orthodox Christianity. These results have been intensified and deepened by the psychological attack directed at the nature of religious experience itself. Conversion is explained as the outbreak of "repressions," and the feeling of the Lord's presence as projection of one's own ideal personality into an objective source. Thus the two bases of Christian faith, the Written Word and "Christian Experience," have been explained away on rationalistic and naturalistic grounds. Can we wonder that so many look upon Christianity as an outgrown relic of the past?

The prospect of the disappearance of religion raises questions of the utmost importance for humanity. These questions are discussed by the author with breadth and penetration in the chapter on "The Issues Critical for Humanity." Only an elaborate analysis and presentation could do justice to the discussion. The alternative to religion is some sort of secular organization based upon humanistic and socialistic principles. In considering the abandonment of religion we must remind ourselves that the arts, amusements, and holidays have their origin and sanction in religion; and what is even more important, the deep motives of life have their seat in religion. Without these motives life becomes irrational; and without the idea of God and the sustaining power of God the human mind itself is bereft of reason. The present relativistic doctrines of truth and morals are a natural consequence of disbelief in God. Apart from religion the idea of personal and social progress becomes futile, for the reason that the motives to progress are lacking. The never-ending round of individual lives and social strife, without communion with God and the hope of blessed continu-

ance in the higher world, would beget pessimism, despair, and unendurable misery.

We are faced with the question, whether or not the extinction of religion is inevitable under modern conditions. The author suggests in the chapter on "The Prospects of Recovery" certain possibilities which may afford grounds for a new religious development such as to provide a religion adequate to the needs of modern life. He thinks that the battle against atheism and materialism has been won, and that in this struggle the need of religion has been made manifest. In the return from materialism to religion much of modern thought has rested at certain stopping places. These are to a certain extent substitutes for the idea of God, and thus serve as half-way positions. Some of the more important of these are apostrophized Reason, Humanity, Nature, Life-force, and Progress. Life-force takes the place of God in the naturalism of the day. This Life-force is supposed somehow to develop mind; but mind developed from Life-force which is thought to be without consciousness and without preconceived purpose, would be no more mind than mind developed from inorganic material. Such a mind would belong to a naturalistic not to a spiritual universe. If this type of thought be pushed to its logical conclusion, it would end in contradiction, and the demand for the idea of God as the universal and supreme Mind would appear. Reason has been regarded as the supreme human function and a universal criterion; but this again would mean a universal and supreme Mind, and the way to the acknowledgment of God would be open. By the use of rational methods Kant and Bergson undertook to show the inadequacy of reason; and intuition was relied upon to reach certain truth. It would seem, however, that greater faith in reason would promote a return to religion.

It is the fashion of the day in many quarters to worship progress as a substitute for religion. This raises the question as to the nature and fact of progress. An analysis of the idea and fact of progress shows that it involves purpose and goal. To see the end from the beginning and the beginning from the end is assuredly the function of mind, and in the case of uni-

versal progress it would needs be a universal Mind. If we look at the actual movements, intellectual and social, of the present day, they are found to be exceedingly complicated, and in many ways conflicting. The most threatening of the movements is the combination of atheism and socialism, which, in the name of progress, aims at the destruction of the existing order, both religious and industrial. The reconstruction intended has in view a class conflict which would annihilate the class now holding the reins of power. To be well directed, any such revolutionary movement requires an adequate knowledge of the general aim and purpose of human life, a knowledge of the meaning and basis of truth, and in the end the acknowledgment of God. We may therefore look to progress itself to compel real thinking. It may need a generation of atheism, revolution, and chaos to force mankind to re-action; but a little forward thinking might avoid such calamitous experience. "It is this forward thinking that we must press upon our generation: it will bring us back to religion by a safer and less suffering way."

This rapid sketch of a well furnished and valuable discussion shows that the prospects of any general recovery of religion rest upon advanced interpretations of the actual tendencies and movements of the time; but it is obvious that, while the religious tone is preserved throughout, the force of the argument is naturalistic. The author has no glimpse of the possibility and necessity of a new revelation of Divine Truth, which alone would bring about a genuine and positive recovery of religion.

With the prospect of the recovery of religion, the re-consideration of the claims of Christianity come to view. All who seek the truth must face the claim of Christianity to be the truth. The pursuit of truth presupposes the mind capable of attaining the truth. Such a mind implies the existence of God, Who bestows the power to discover the truth. We may dismiss other forms of religion, and consider only Christianity. Pantheism and deism both rule out religion; Hinduism is a form of pantheism; and Buddhism is a form of psychology rather than a religion. Zoroastrianism has in essence passed into Judaism; and Mahommedanism is a half-way house between

Judaism and Christianity. Judaism is developed in Christianity. Christianity alone is capable of withstanding the attacks of skepticism. The validity of Christianity depends upon the nature of Christ. In view of the contradictory results of historical analysis and criticism, we are justified in taking the Gospels at face value, and accepting Christ as God incarnate, as being both God and man. The further doctrine as to the Nature of Christ and as to His relation to men and mankind is aside from the purpose in hand. There is, however, brief discussion of Christ's relation to man, and especially some discussion of fundamental importance concerning Christ as the truth, and of truth as personality. On the basis of certain principles briefly presented, it is predicted that it will be found "that Christianity is necessary for the validation of philosophy, the sanction of science, and the economic redemption of mankind."

The author is profoundly convinced, and tries to convince others, that the rehabilitation of the Church must accompany the revival of religion. He notes the prevailing fashion of distinguishing between Christ and Christianity, and also between Christianity and the Church. In the movement of recovery these stages will be retraced. The importance of the Church lies in the fact that religion, especially Christianity, is a spiritual communion, that is, a communion of men who share a common spiritual life. This involves an organization of men for common worship and for other purposes. The author himself professes an inclusive Catholicism which provides one Church wherein all Christian denominations have their own proper place. He thinks that "there is slowly taking place in men's minds a rehabilitation of the idea of the Church as absolutely necessary, not only to Christianity, but to humanity."

The revival of religion, it is maintained, depends, after certain adverse conditions and forces are overcome, upon a fuller and general development of mysticism. Mysticism at its best is supposed to be an interpretation of the genuine experience of the Lord's presence and operation in the soul, and as such is the true Christian experience, and the real and true basis of Chris-

tian thought and life. It is in such experience that religion must have its revival.

We are glad to find in the book as a whole so much clear thinking and helpful discussion. Any one who wants to acquaint himself with the facts and the arguments involved in the serious and pressing subject of the religious conditions of modern life will find here a well done and stimulating account. In tone and substance the book is wholesome and educative. At some points the author is at the disadvantage of holding the position of traditional orthodoxy. He thinks of the Lord as the Second Person of the Trinity, and seems to hold to the orthodox theory of the Atonement; but, although these are fundamental, they are treated incidentally.

It is somewhat surprising that the author seems to have no acquaintance with the doctrines of the NEW JERUSALEM. An acquaintance with the doctrine of the Second Coming of the Lord would have given him new and indispensable light. In that light he would have had clearer and more definite grounds for expecting a revival of religion and the triumph of Christianity.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH*

Dr. Machen, now Professor of New Testament in the Westminster Theological Seminary of Philadelphia, formerly served with Professor Robert Dick Wilson on the faculty of the Princeton (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary. Both left, a few years ago, when Princeton suffered a dissention between the Liberals and the Conservatives. The Westminster Seminary was founded by the Conservatives who withdrew their support from Princeton; and it upholds the Fundamentalism, so-called, which lost its supremacy at Princeton.

A popular view among liberals and intellectuals (the terms

* *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. By J. GRESHAM MACHEN. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1930. 415 pp., 8vo. \$5.00.

are often, though quite erroneously, supposed to be interchangeable) holds that Fundamentalism is the belief only of the ignorant, a kind of lower-world Protestant counterpart to the "faith of the millions" as preached by Hibernian Catholicism. No doubt not many wise, not many learned persons are to be found at Tremont Temple, or Calvary Baptist, or even at Park Street Church. Yet a glance into Dr. Machen's portentous tome will be sufficient to banish the notion that Protestant Fundamentalism is untenable—or at any rate is held only by peasants and cranks.

Machen is a thorough scholar: quite *au courant* with the latest literature of his subject in French and German, given to liberal documentation of his every assertion. Moderate and cautious in temper, like the great Butler of the "Analogy," he does full justice to the arguments on the other side, and admits only after careful scrutiny what may be said for his own position.

Of course, Machen has a theology and a world-view, about which he is quite frank. He believes in the reality of sin, and that it "places an awful gulf between man and God." Such convictions seem to him, though unpopular at the present time, to be "certainly quite central in the Christian religion. From the beginning Christianity was the religion of the broken heart; it is based upon the conviction that there is an awful gulf between man and God which none but God can bridge."

But Machen cannot be accused of distorting his evidence to justify his belief. Whatever his private views, his argument proceeds on purely rational and scientific grounds, and the argument from authority never makes its appearance.

The first eleven chapters consider the evidence for the Virgin Birth; the next three chapters consider alternative theories (that of Jewish derivation and that of Pagan derivation); and the last chapter draws conclusions and consequences. Machen's scholarship and his masterly handling of an involved case appear to especial advantage in the chapter on alleged pagan analogies to the Virgin Birth (see particularly pages 336-339).

The Conclusion puts sincerely and appealingly the case for

the Fundamentalist. Machen himself is a straightforward sort of man; and he resents the resort of current theologians and especially current preachers to a studied ambiguity of language calculated to mean one thing to the user and another to his unsuspecting congregation. Machen sees quite clearly that phrases like "I believe in the Deity of Christ," or even "I believe that Jesus is God," may be used to convey a meaning totally divorced from their historical sense. There are few formulæ which may not so be wrested to the use of the Modernist.

How are we to "discover anyone's position in the great religious issue [Fundamentalism versus Modernism] of the present day"? Machen thinks the Virgin Birth one test case still operative; one which a man may apply "to himself or to others to determine whether one holds a naturalistic or a supernaturalistic view regarding Jesus Christ." Machen is doubtless too optimistic: no phrase and no dogma can permanently resist modernistic "interpretation." But the Virgin Birth is perhaps one of the more obdurate.

As for Christian apologetic, Machen admits that the Virgin Birth does not logically come first. "Before the Virgin Birth come the things for which testimony in the very nature of the case can be more abundant than for this. To those things no doubt the inquirer should be directed first, before he comes to consider this mystery which was first attested perhaps only by the mother of the Lord." But Machen does hold, and with very great reason, that "the Virgin Birth is an integral part of the New Testament witness about Christ, and that that witness is strongest when it is taken as it stands. . . . The New Testament presentation of Jesus is not an agglomeration, but an organism. . . . Remove the part, and the whole becomes harder and not easier to accept."

We are grateful to Dr. Machen for this learned and closely reasoned defence of the historic faith of the Church.

AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D.

THE FOUNDER OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE •

In August, 1929, Charles Scribner's Sons published a biography of "the founder of Christian Science", by Edwin F. Dakin.* that was at once hailed as a masterly and unbiassed presentation of the life history of one of the most remarkable women of all time,—hailed, that is, by all except adherents of the religious organization she had founded, who were promptly reminded by the publicity bureau of that organization that there was a rule in their Church Manual reading "a member of this church shall not patronize a publishing house or bookstore that has for sale obnoxious books," and were instructed to do everything in their power to suppress the book as inimical to their cause. The resulting boycott of the publisher, and of booksellers and librarians who continued to offend the multitudinous Christian Scientists throughout our country by distributing the book, had enormous effect in hindering the natural circulation of the treatise, and constituted a most serious challenge to the publishers and to the general public alike as to "censorship," "freedom of the press," and like matters. Fortunately for the world, the publishers were not to be balked in any such way. They met the challenge by the publication of a second edition of the book at a popular price (\$2 instead of the original \$5), and by much publicity concerning the inquisitorial methods of persecution carried on by the Christian Science directorate in its efforts to suppress the truth concerning Mrs. Eddy. As a natural reaction, the book has been having an enormous sale; and everybody interested in promoting truth and suppressing falsity in connection with "the revelator and the revelation" of Christian Science should be encouraged to read it. It was not planned as an attack upon Christian Science (the teachings of which are expounded but superficially and subjected to but incidental criticism, mostly in one chapter), but as a chronological setting forth of pertinent facts in the life of this remarkable woman,—remarkable not from any real genius of a praiseworthy sort in herself, but from what

* *Mrs. Eddy; The Biography of a Virginal Mind.* By EDWIN FRANDEN DAKIN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1930. 575 pp., 8vo. Popular Edition, \$2.00.

she was able to "put over" on a great number of people who, whatever their virtues in general, may mostly be characterized as shallow thinkers ambitious of health, happiness, worldly well-being, and social standing from association with an apparently prosperous and rapidly growing new phase of the Christian religion at a time when Protestant Christianity as a whole is undergoing a period of increasing unrest and threatened disintegration. It is worthy of note at this point that as Christian Science denies the actuality of evil, it of course denies the actuality of sin, and therefore again makes the solidian bid for popularity.

Turning now to the book before us, we find it divided into five main parts, with captions as follows: *A Quest for Minerva's Parentage*; *A Book to Conjure With*; *A Woman Becomes a Deity*; *The Secret Place of the Most High*; and *The Twilight of a God*. There are two appendices, the first giving from Calvin Frye's diaries corroborative evidence concerning Mrs. Eddy's physical and mental ills and her use of morphine, and the second dealing with Mrs. Eddy's Use of Sources, by way of substantiating the charge of plagiarism. It is in this latter appendix that Mr. Dakin gives us the best summary statement for our purpose, from which we think best to quote as follows:

Because many Christian Scientists, grateful for the healing and inspiration they have gained from Mrs. Eddy's psychology, have therefore subscribed to all of her other teachings whole, they have bitterly resented the biographical statement that her doctrines were not inspired direct from Heaven but came largely through the channel of an obscure and repudiated country practitioner. . . . Not many thrusts, however, are required to puncture the balloon of the claim that Mrs. Eddy's own statements as to her divine inspiration should be taken literally. . . . A study of her lesser writings will show that she went boldly to several philosophers besides Quimby to seek not only inspiration but also the verbiage to express it. Nor did she give credit to those who met her need.

For an adequate understanding of Mrs. Eddy it must be realized, as I have insisted elsewhere, that most of her career was born not of a desire to express to the world a vital message that defied repression. It arose not from a passion to save suffering humanity. It resulted not from a prophet's urge to preach to the world regardless of all cost to self. Mrs. Eddy was not this fairly usual type of evangelist. Her literary efforts sprang primarily from. . . . a desire to attain importance in a world which had previously ignored and spurned her. Her church organization grew

up out of these literary efforts—was her means, indeed, of marketing them. It was for her another device by which she could impress herself on her environment. The measures she devised for its government and operation stand as evidence of this. To speak in homely language, Mrs. Eddy from the days of her girlhood wanted fiercely "to be somebody." Literary distinction was the specific goal she early set for herself. . . . Now the great trouble with many who are ambitious for self-expression in the field of literature, the reason why so many would-be authors fail to make a lasting mark on their time, is that they never discover anything impressive to say. Mrs. Eddy's success dates from the time when, largely by accident, she discovered something extremely important—a message which, so far as the public of her time was concerned, seemed new. That it was eventually through a theological organization as much as through a book that Mrs. Eddy secured recognition for her idea and hence for herself, that the idea was not originally her own, that she never even learned to think or write about adequately,—these things constitute one of those human anomalies which constantly arise to confound and amaze the student of the Eddy career. . . .

When she sat down to write about her doctrines, her motivating impulse was less an eagerness to share salvation with the world than to win from this world mere acclaim for personal achievement. This conclusion is forced upon us for the simple reason that no other hypotheses will fit all the enormous contradictions in her career. This one explains the whole tragic history. . . . All her long, tragic life she had known only one urge—the necessity of Self. This persisted until the end.

There is practically nothing that is lovely and heavenly in the life of Mrs. Eddy (1821-1910). A frail country woman, intermittently sickly both physically and mentally all her life, subject to hysteria and in later years to katatonia, her "virginal mind . . . never married to reality" (p. 212), of no attainments and a burden upon others up to middle life and later, illiterate but ambitious of authorship, a dabbler in mesmerism, spiritualism, etc., her visits to Quimby in 1862 and 1864 for treatment and for study of his methods were the turning point in her life.

She was greatly benefitted in health by Quimby's treatment; was with him in Portland three weeks the first time and eight weeks the second time, during which periods she was allowed to be with him while treating his patients, and was permitted to copy as much as she wished from his somewhat voluminous manuscripts, her copy of his little treatise on "Questions and Answers", which contained the gist of all his teachings, becoming

from that time the most precious thing she possessed. Without those manuscripts Mrs. Eddy would never have made any impression on the world. She was enthusiastic about the teachings they contained and could talk with her friends and acquaintances of little else. On the death of Quimby in 1866, and the subsequent departure of the Dressers (who knew all about her relations with Quimby) to the Pacific coast, the way was opened for her gradually to appropriate those teachings and to promulgate them as her own. This she did in the book she wrote between 1866 and 1870, finally published in 1876 as "Science and Health." This underwent many revisions during the following years, and was entirely rewritten for her by Rev. J. H. Wiggin about 1885. It would be well for the world if a photofacsimile reprint of the original first edition were published for comparison with the Quimby manuscripts, etc.

So far as can be learned, Mrs. Eddy herself had no ability as a healer; at least, in spite of her own amazing claims, there is no good evidence that she ever performed any cures. Her forte was as a teacher of the principles of mental healing—twelve lessons (later seven) at \$300—in which she had much success, many of her pupils becoming able practitioners. Her ten years in Lynn (1870-81) had many hectic aspects, evidencing the dominating element of SELF in every move; but they served as preparation for later developments, her first efforts at a church and at a college coming at the end of that period, shortly before her move to Boston. Then came the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, the Christian Science Journal, the National Christian Science Association, the Christian Science Church, etc., etc. Her dictatorial hold on these, and the working of everything and everybody for her own advantage, manifests business genius of the first water, but constitutes a most gruesome tale of selfishness, continued to the end of her days. We cannot enter into details here. We can but recommend all who wish to comprehend the founder and the movement of Christian Science to read Mr. Dakin's book.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

The regular price for the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is
and for the NEW-CHURCH LEAGUE JOURNAL is

\$2.00

\$1.00

WE OFFER

A JOINT SUBSCRIPTION TO BOTH FOR \$2.50

provided such joint subscription adds a new name to at least one of the periodicals. Such joint subscription may be addressed either to the LEAGUE JOURNAL or to the

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, 134 Bowdoin St., BOSTON, MASS.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price \$1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, \$1.00 per volume, postpaid

Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street

New York, N. Y.

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left \$15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.

Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3312 Barrington Road.

Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.

Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.

Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.

Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.

Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 599 So. Westmoreland Ave.

Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.

New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.

New-Church Press, 168 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.

Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.

San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.

St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.

Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.

Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1

Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.

Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also cooperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over \$65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,

CHARLES N. MASON,

JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.